

# Slums of the World:

## The face of urban poverty in the new millennium?

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries or regarding its economic system or degree of development. The analysis, conclusions and recommendations of the report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), the Governing Council of UN-HABITAT or its Member States.

Excerpts from this publication may be reproduced without authorization, on condition that the source is indicated.

© United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT), 2003

ISBN: 92-1-131683-9  
Series ISBN: 92-1-131684-7  
HS/692/03E

United Nations Human Settlements Programme publications can be obtained from UN-HABITAT Regional and Information Offices or directly from:

P.O. Box 30030, GPO 00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Fax: +(254-20) 624060  
E-mail: [habitat.publications@unhabitat.org](mailto:habitat.publications@unhabitat.org)  
Website: <http://www.unhabitat.org>

# FOREWORD



**T**he *Slums of the World Report* appears at a time of growing awareness of the red flags raised by the urbanization process, particularly because of an increasing number and proportion of city residents who live in poverty in precarious settlements in the core historic part of cities and in the peri-urban areas.

The empirical evidence compiled in this study is overwhelming. Today, one-third of the world's urban population lives in slums, and four out of ten inhabitants in the developing world are informal settlers.

This information is available because for the first time a baseline information on slums was produced, surveying over 1 million household records and compiling data from over 316 different sub-national, national and international sources.

This enormous work was done by the Global Urban Observatory (GUO) of UN-HABITAT in collaboration with the African Population and Health Research Centre (APHRC). The study represents a milestone in the efforts of UN-HABITAT to monitor progress in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goal 7, Target 11, for which we are the responsible agency for the improvement of the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by the year 2020.

The number of issues relevant to urban poverty and slums is practically infinite. This study is accordingly confining itself to the global estimation of slums at the country level, establishing quantitative and qualitative analysis of the statistical information produced.

Based on these preliminary estimates on slums, it will be possible to develop time series on slum indicators, helping to track in a more systematic manner the 'improvement' in the lives of these informal dwellers.

Adopting the agreed methodology to local context and needs, Governments would be able to set up their own targets directed at meeting the MDG objective. Likewise, the GUO would be able to undertake future analysis on slum incidence and trends, in order to establish comparisons between countries, sub-regions and regions.

Awareness of the magnitude of slums in the world is key. As awareness increases so openness to discuss this issue increases as well and new ideas will inevitably expand.

This Report therefore merits attention by all partners of the Habitat Agenda at a time when slums are being clearly identified as a crucial development issue around the world. They are, after all, pointers of the most acute scenarios of urban poverty and physical and environmental deprivation.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Anna Kajumulo Tibaijuka".

Mrs. Anna Kajumulo Tibaijuka  
Executive Director  
United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT)

# CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	5
1. INTRODUCTION.....	6
2. THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES .....	10
2.1 Global Population Growth in Urban Areas.....	10
2.2 The Urbanization of Poverty .....	12
3. THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS .....	14
3.1 The Global Conferences and the MDGs .....	14
3.2 The “Cities without Slums” Target and UN-HABITAT .....	14
3.3 Efforts towards Monitoring the Target 11 .....	14
4. METHODOLOGY OF DATA COLLECTION .....	18
4.1 Concepts and Definitions .....	18
What is a slum dweller?.....	18
4.2 Estimation Methodology.....	18
4.3 Process of Slum Dweller Estimation for each Country .....	19
4.4 Primary and Secondary Data Sources.....	20
4.5 Data Limitations .....	21
5. DATA ANALYSIS: PRINCIPAL FINDINGS.....	24
5.1 General Aspects .....	24
High correlation between slum-dwellers and Human Development Index.....	24
Urban poverty and slums incidence.....	24
A Regional dimension of slum indicators .....	24
Where do the slum dwellers live? .....	26
Urban growth and slum proliferation .....	26
Links between macro economic performance and slum incidence.....	27
5.2 Urban Slums of the World: Global Figures .....	30
5.3 Slum Dwellers by MDG Regions.....	32
Africa .....	32
Asia .....	36
Latin America .....	40
Oceania .....	42
6. FURTHER DISCUSSION .....	46
6.1 An Information Crisis .....	46
6.2 The need for Sub-city Level Information .....	46
6.3 Refine the Precision of the Estimation.....	50
Water and sanitation .....	50
Durability of housing and overcrowding.....	50
Secure tenure.....	50
7. CONCLUSIONS.....	54
8. REFERENCES.....	56
8. ANNEXES.....	58
Annex 1: General Limitations of the Data .....	58
Missing Value Estimation .....	58
Example using regression equation for Asia .....	58
Example using regression equation for Latin America .....	58
Annex 2: Types of ‘slums’ and the words used in 30 cities worldwide .....	60
Annex 3: Slums: statistical annexes .....	76

# CONTENTS

## TABLES

Table 1: Slum estimation: primary data sources .....	20
Table 2: Slum estimation: data limitations .....	21
Table 3: Developing regions: per cent of urban population lacking access to improved water and sanitation.....	25
Table 4: Population of slum areas at mid-year 2001 (UN-HABITAT) – summary.....	28
Table 5: Population of slum areas in developing regions at mid-year 2001 – detail .....	31
Table 6a: Distribution of total and Urban Population by developing regions 2001 (Mid Year) .....	33
Table 6b: Distribution of Urban Population by Slum and Slum, 2001 (Mid Year) .....	33
Table 7: Urban and Slum population in Africa .....	33
Table 8: Slum distribution in Asian sub-regions .....	37
Table 9: LDCs in the South-central Asia sub-region.....	38
Table 10: LDCs in the South-eastern Asia sub-region .....	38
Table 11: Slum incidence in LAC Region .....	40
Table 12: Highest incidence of slums in Oceania.....	42

## FIGURES

Figure 1: World Population growth 1950-2020.....	10
Figure 2: Regression equation between percentage of slum dwellers and HDI.....	24
Figure 3: Proportion of slum dwellers to total urban population: Africa .....	26
Figure 4: Proportion of slum dwellers to total urban population: Asia .....	26
Figure 5: High slum incidence and urban growth rate.....	27
Figure 6: Low slum incidence and urban growth rate.....	27
Figure 7: Proportion of slum dwellers and urban population per developing regions .....	31
Figure 8: Africa's population growth 1950-2020.....	34
Figure 9: Proportion of the urban and slum populations in Asia and slum population .....	37
Figure 10: Proportion of the urban and slum populations in the Asian region .....	37
Figure 11: Asia's population growth 1950-2030.....	39
Figures 12 and 13: Easter and South-eastern Asia's population growth .....	39
Figure 14: Population growth for Kiribati and Fiji (1950-2030) .....	42
Figure 15: Regression equation for overcrowding in Africa .....	58
Figure 16: Regression equation for overcrowding in Asia .....	58
Figure 17: Regression equation for overcrowding in Latin America .....	59
Figure 17: Regression equation for overcrowding in the world.....	59



## BOXES

Box 1: What is a “slum” .....	7
Box 2: Mega-cities and slum incidence .....	11
Box 3: MDGs goals and targets .....	15
Box 4: Detailed definitions of acceptable urban conditions .....	19
Box 5: Example of slum dweller estimation.....	20
Box 6: The words that describe the slums .....	30
Box 7: Data collection on slums.....	48
Box 8: Maps of poverty and GIS – understanding intra-city differentials.....	48

## MAPS

Map 1: Urban slum population of the world .....	30
Map 2: Prevalence of slums in Africa per country.....	32
Map 3: Prevalence of slums in Asia per country .....	36
Map 4: Prevalence of slums in LAC per country .....	40
Map 5: Map of urban poverty in Cape Town, South Africa .....	47
Map 6: Urban poverty map: income and informal settlements.....	49

# ACRONYMS

APHRC	African Population and Health Research Centre
CEPAL	Comisión Económica para América Latina
DESA	Department of Economic and Social Affairs
DHS	Demographic and Health Surveys
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
EGM	Expert Group Meeting
EHP	Environmental Health Project
ESCAP	United Nations, Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific
FAFO	Norwegian Institute for Applied Social Science
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GNI	Gross National Income
GUO	Global Urban Observatory
HDI	Human Development Index
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean Region
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys
NSO	National Statistics office
PARPA	Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty (Mozambique)
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UN	United Nations
UNCCAS	UN Common Country Assessment and Strategy
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNPD	United Nations Population Division
UNSD	United Nations Statistical Division
USAID	United States Aid Agency
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization
WWAP	World Water Assessment Programme



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As noted by Manuel Castells in his recent book, *The Power of Identity*<sup>1</sup>, the Information Age originates from a collective genius. Groundbreaking inventions and discoveries are no longer the masterpiece of one great mind, like it was until the 21st Century. In contemporary world, achievements result from the culmination of small discoveries or ideas of many actors. The same applies to this report which can be traced back to the Millennium Declaration in September 2000, and the efforts made by national and international actors to monitor progress on these goals.

Placed within the wider system of monitoring as such, UN-HABITAT restructured its plans to monitor Target 11, that aims to improve the lives of at least one hundred million slum dwellers by 2020. It is the intensified implementation of this new monitoring strategy by UN-HABITAT's very special team; global estimation of slums by the African Population and Health Research Centre; the in-depth engagement of several experts and decision-makers in a series of Expert Group Meeting (EGM) and the excellent authorship of Eduardo Lopez Moreno, that gave life to this report.

The circle of people or initiatives which made this report possible, in fact goes much beyond UN-HABITAT's team and its partners. We could not have extracted the actual substance of the report, had it not been for the availability of numerous household survey or census data. Therefore much gratitude goes to the teams that implemented and analyzed hundreds of Demographic and Health Surveys of USAID, the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys of UNICEF, and the National Statistical Office teams of selected countries that undertook the Population and the Housing Censuses.

Needless to say that we owe it to the dynamics of the Information Age and transparency policies that those data sets were so easily accessible on the Internet. We hail all the decision-makers and leaders who made this possible and thank them for contributing to international development, through going public with these treasures of knowledge, surveys and census data. Finally, we are grateful to the millions of respondents who took time to answer several questions asked by the surveys or by the censuses.

Within this big picture of anonymous contributors, several people have contributed either during the process leading to this report or in its production.

### Expert Group Meeting

I would like to express my very sincere appreciation to the United Nations Statistical Division and the Cities Alliance for their collaboration in the organization of the EGM that took place in Nairobi in October 2002. This meeting – that assembled 35 international professionals from around the world – refined the definitions of secure tenure and slums and defined related indicators, based on the Habitat Background Papers prepared by Christine Auclair, Harvey Herr, Nefise Bazoglu and Martin Raithelhuber.

My gratitude also goes to the experts who attended the EGM: John Barreh, Elisa Lustosa Caillaux, Fernando Cavallieri, William Cobbett, Diana Meirelles Da Motta, Jean Du Plessis, Alain Durand-Lasserve, Joe Flood, Erlinda Go, Mark Hildebrand, Robert Johnston, Tony Lloyd Jones, Miloon Kothari, Rajeev Malhotra, Aman Mehta, Pierre Ngom, Tumsifu Jonas Nnkya, Robin Rajack, Shea Rutstein, S. Onsare, Yap Kioe Sheng, Daniela Simioni, Coughlan Pather, Saad Yahya, Stephanie Wilcock and Jane Weru.

I also thank UN-HABITAT staff who participated in this meeting, namely: Christine Auclair, Nick Bain, Daniel Biau, Marjolein Benschop, Yves Cabannes, Tanzib Chowdhury, Selman Erguden, Joseph Guiebo, Harvey Herr, Inge Jensen, Dinesh Mehta, Iouri Moisseev, Eduardo López Moreno, Alberto Paranhos, Martin Raithelhuber, Farouk Tebbal, Raf Tuts and Chris Williams.

Had it not been for the debate initiated with them and most notably during the EGM this book could not have been written.

### Slum Estimation

Likewise, this report would not have been successfully completed without the tremendous effort that Gora Mboup, from the Africa Population Health Research Centre (APHRC) and his team, undertook with the collaboration of Harvey Herr, the key data analyst in GUO.

After appropriately refining the slum definition, together with Christine Auclair, and Harvey Herr, Gora Mboup reviewed and expanded the existing UN-HABITAT methodology to estimate the number of slum dwellers, by holding a secondary analysis on masses of data provided by the household surveys and censuses.

### This Publication

Very warm congratulations goes to the author of this study, Eduardo López Moreno, Chief of the Global Urban Observatory.

In addition to Mr. Moreno's work, the document reflects the ideas and concepts that the Monitoring System Branch and the GUO have accumulated over the years from different contributions, whose originators are now hard to trace. The credit for the production of the document should also go to the work done by Gora Mboup and Harvey Herr concerning the preparation of the methodology for the data collection, Chapter 4 of this working paper.

Numerous colleagues contributed to this work through critical readings, suggestions, conversations and other less tangible form of encouragement. I would like to thank, among other, Christine Auclair, Clarissa Augustinus, Uddhab Bhandary, Daniel Biau, Harvey Herr, Tony-Lloyd Jones, Joseph Maseland, Iouri Moisseev, Don Okpala, Lars Reutersward, Anirban Pal and Farouk Tebbal.

Special thanks are due to the Center for International Earth Science Information Network at Columbia University, New York, USA, for their kind contribution providing the city poverty maps using GIS technology. I also extend my thanks to UN-HABITAT's staff for their able assistance in the elaboration of graphs and slum maps, particularly Samson Kassahun, Samuel Kihara, Musyimi Mbathi, Philip Mukungu and Martin Raithelhuber.

Special acknowledgement, however, is extended to the million of slum dwellers in the world, who live discriminated against and with unequal access to essential social services such as water, drainage and sewerage. They represent, as the book title states, the face of urban poverty that confronts us at a time when we are in the midst of an international economic revolution.

Nefise Bazoglu  
Chief, Monitoring Systems Branch

<sup>1</sup> Castells Manuel, *The Power of Identity: the Information Age - Economy, Society and Culture*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, UK, 1997.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

*Y tu vieja ¡pobre vieja!  
Lava toda la semana  
Pa' poder parar la olla  
Con pobreza franciscana  
En el triste conventillo  
Alumbrado a kerosén.*

Margot, Tango Argentino  
Celedonio Flores

As the arrival of the new millennium turns a new page of history, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the world is returning to some of its fundamental, unresolved questions: the issues of equity, sustainability, poverty and social justice, among others. Despite growing awareness of the progress in the global urban transition and the accompanying disproportionate growth of the proportion of poor urban residents, relatively little research attention has been paid to the slum<sup>1</sup> dwellers that populate the planet.

This situation is probably related to a historic dichotomy between rural and urban poverty, and to the general tendency to treat poverty in human settlements as a homogeneous issue of “the urban poor”. It is also due to a strong bias against urban issues by a variety of players, including certain country regimes, donors, and in many cases, international agencies, which is characterized by: a) perceptions of cities as rich and rural areas as poor; b) the unfortunate juxtaposition of the images of the “good peasant” feeding the nation vs. the slum dweller as bearer of crime and disease, and; c) simplistic notions that cities and capitals are the loci of corruption and mismanagement<sup>2</sup>. In addition, slums – all variety of precarious settlements – represent the “invisible” city, often omitted from official maps and documents and frequently physically hidden by local authorities by colorful walls and fences. A “denied” city is therefore excluded from the governing structures at local, provincial and national levels restricting resources and powers available to the “visible” part of the city.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, slums are habitually put aside from the established routine collection of data by the National Statistics Offices and the Statistics Institutions<sup>4</sup>. A corollary of this being that policy actions rarely segregate poverty in the cities and poverty in the slums; even worse, quite often urban development policies and investments do not explicitly include slum areas.

Yet, the following factors point to the need for urgent attention on slums not only as an emerging type of urban population growth but as a **new paradigm of human settlements**, that require the creation of a new classification of human settlements: (*urban*) *slums*, which should be added to the existing rural-urban categorization. The factors that we are referring to are: a) rapid, unregulated and informal forms of urbanization amid poverty; b) negative depiction of overall urbanization; c) urban poor health and environmental conditions; and, d) uniqueness of development dynamics, resources and issues, in slums.

Relatively poor knowledge of local and global forces shaping development and producing/reproducing urban poverty, the complexity of the accompanying phenomena and the uncertainty of urban decision-making processes, call for a better understanding of inter- and intra-city differentials in poverty and inequality. This basically means a need for better understanding of slum incidence.



The present document is the culmination of attempts to come to grips with changes in the way we measure slums, starting by providing an agreed – universal – definition of this type of settlements and a clear methodological approach. The preliminary estimations presented in this document represent a *baseline year level* that permits the preparation of quantitative estimates for future trends.

The current working paper presents the results of a first global enumeration of slums at the country level.<sup>5</sup> The data are analyzed and comparisons established at sub-regional and regional levels while trying to understand what is happening globally. Starting from an adopted and agreed statistically measurable definition of slums<sup>6</sup>, the collection and analysis of data, using existing sources of information became feasible for the first time.

The study was undertaken by the Global Urban Observatory of UN-HABITAT in collaboration with the African Population and Health Research Centre (APHRC). It was developed within the broad framework of the Millennium Development Goal 7, Target 11, for which UN-HABITAT is the responsible agency for the improvement of the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by the year 2020.

This document is a complement to the Global Report on Human Settlements “The Challenge of the Slums” that UN-HABITAT is planning to publish soon. The GUO has found it necessary to go into detail in the slum analysis by providing preliminary figures.

This preliminary estimate and first descriptive analysis require further development through more detailed examination of how data were collected and the assumptions of the estimation procedure. The methodology used in the study should be reviewed and expanded on a country-by-country basis, to adapt the definition and related indicators to the local context. Only after the measurement method is agreed upon and tested would it be possible to refine estimates, draw comparisons, and propose nationally defined improvement targets, which should be considered as numeric and time-bound targets directed at meeting the objective of the MDGs, Target 11 by country.

In this sense, the working paper promotes a better understanding of poverty monitoring and analysis in the field of local and national governance for of data collection and analysis systems. By providing the methodology and the quantitative knowledge base, the document strives to enhance the use of information on urban poverty, as a powerful policy-making tool to help induce the desired structural changes for poverty alleviation. To this end, the current document aims at promoting national and international dialogue on urban poverty issues, particularly with regards to intra-city differentials.

Based on the findings of the study, this paper advocates for the need to produce spatially disaggregated data in order to address urban inequalities (slum and non-slum strata), to facilitate reporting at city-level along with country-level reporting, which is the present mandate and the practice of the United Nations System. This will contribute to redirecting attention and future investments towards slum areas, which are, after all, the pointers of the most acute scenarios of urban poverty and physical and environmental deprivation.



### Box 1: What is a slum\*

The word “slum” appeared in the London cant at the beginning of the 19th century, designating initially “a room of low repute” or “low, unfrequented parts of the town”. During the major part of the 19th century, the word appeared in the written language in quotation marks mostly as “back-slum(s)”. At the end of the 19th century, the word is used as defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as,

*“A street, alley, court, etc., situated in a crowded district of a town or city and inhabited by people of a low class or by the very poor; a number of these streets or courts forming a thickly populated neighborhood or district where the houses and the conditions of life are of a squalid and wretched character”.*

The word then underwent a series of changes during the Housing Reform Movement in England. It took a legal and technical acceptance to designate “a house materially unfit for human habitation” and became a common word losing its quotation marks in the 1880s. The Housing Reform changed a popular word, which once described an awkward phenomenon to a general operational concept that made possible the delimitation of “slum areas” on current city maps for planning purpose. It became a common word in the anglophone world, used for example in India (up to date) in order to designate without distinction the “bustees”, “chawls”, or “cheris” of Mumbai, Delhi or Chennai.

The 20th century made the word obsolete in many contexts requiring more precise and rigorous terms such as “tenement-house”, “tenement district”, and “deteriorated neighborhood” which appeared in the 1890s and the 1930s because of new passed legislation authorizing the eradication of the so called slums which imposed technical and legal definitions and standards for such actions. At the same time, the Social Movement generated new words such as “neighborhoods” or “communities” to qualify the designated slums, in order to “rename” the socially stigmatized slum areas. In the 1920s, the American “city planners” started to use the concept of “neighborhood unit” which later will be incorporated into the international vocabulary of urban planning.

One has to note the current distinction made up to date between slums and shanties. While slums describe old residential buildings which have deteriorated and lack essential services (but in most cases do not lack security in terms of tenure), shanties refer to spontaneous settlements which have developed in outskirts and unbuilt areas of the city. At the First World Urban Forum, a position paper elaborated by UN-HABITAT on “Cities Without Slums” used the term slum to describe,

*a wide range of low-income settlements and/or poor human living conditions and note that these inadequate housing conditions exemplify the variety of manifestations of poverty as defined in the Programme of Action adopted at the World Summit for Social Development.*

*The term slum includes the traditional meaning, that is, housing areas that were once respectable or even desirable, but which have since deteriorated, as the original dwellers have moved to new and better areas of cities. The condition of the old houses has then declined, and the units have been progressively subdivided and rented out to lower-income groups. A typical example is the inner-city slums of many historical towns and cities in both the industrial and the developing countries.*


*The term slum has, however, come to include also the vast informal settlements that are quickly becoming the most visual expression of urban poverty. The quality of dwellings in such settlements varies from the simplest shack to permanent structures, while access to water, electricity, sanitation and other basic services and infrastructure tends to be limited. Such settlements are referred to by a wide range of names and include a variety of tenurial arrangements.*

\*UN-HABITAT, Expert Group Meeting on urban indicators, Background Paper 2 ‘Defining Secure Tenure, Slums and Global Sample of Cities’, Nairobi, 2002.

# NOTES

- 1 Although the term “slum” is applied to a great variety of settlement types, what these share is an area characterized by social and economic isolation, irregular land ownership, and low standard sanitary and environmental conditions. For the purpose of this study a **slum household** is a group of individuals living under the same roof that lack *one or more* of the following conditions: insecure residential status, inadequate access to safe water, inadequate access to sanitation and other infrastructure, poor structural quality of housing and overcrowding. Refer to the Guide to Monitor Target 11, “Improving the Lives of at Least 100 Million Slum Dwellers”, Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, UN-HABITAT, May 2003.
- 2 Refer to the Background Paper of the Millennium Development Goals, Task Force 8 “Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers”, Millennium Project, New York, 2003.
- 3 Very often resources are only allocated to the “visible” city in detriment of these precarious settlements. MDGs, op cit. 2003.
- 4 Available official statistics typically under-represent or exclude slum dwellers. Few documents mention in explicit terms these poor settlements. Refer to Annex 2.
- 5 A previous attempt was done by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, entitled “World Housing Survey 1974: an overview of the state of housing, building and planning within human settlements”, provided slum country level estimates for 49 nations, New York, 1976.
- 6 UN-HABITAT organized a gathering of experts and other stakeholders from around the globe between 28-30 October 2002 in Nairobi, to reach to an agreement on the universal definition of secure tenure and slums.
- 7 Depaule, J-Ch., Topalov, C. (2000) *La ville à travers ses mots*, Communication to the MOST Project, UNESCO quoting H.J. Dyos et D.A. Reeder “Slums and Suburbs”, in : H.J. Dyos et Michael Wolff, (eds.), *The Victorian City : Images and Realities*, vol. 2, *Shapes on the Ground. A Change of Accent*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973, p. 359-386.

A house is considered as “durable” if it is built on a non-hazardous location and has a structure permanent and adequate enough to protect its inhabitants from the extremes of climatic conditions such as rain, heat, cold, and humidity. (“Structural quality/durability of dwellings”, UN-HABITAT slum indicator)




Topham Picturepoint

## 2 URBAN DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES

### 2.1 Global Population Growth in Urban Areas

For the first time in history, rapid population growth and its concentration in cities around the world constitute a crucial element affecting the long-term outlook for humanity. Despite standing out as centers of civilization and economic activity for eight millennia, cities never attracted more than ten per cent of the global population until the second half of the 19th century. Now, systems of cities have become the world's social, economic, cultural and political matrix.<sup>8</sup> In 1970, 37 per cent of all people lived in urban areas. Around 2007, that percentage is envisaged to reach 50 per cent. Virtually all the population growth expected at the world level during 2000-2030 would concentrate in urban areas (refer to Figure 1). Ninety-five per cent of the population increase expected during 2000-2030 will be absorbed by the urban areas of the less developed regions whose population will likely rise from approximately 2 billion in 2000 to just under 3.5 billion in 2030.<sup>9</sup>

While the global population is expected to increase at an annual rate of less than 1 per cent per annum (0.97 %) over the next thirty years, the urbanized population of the less developed regions will increase by almost 3 per cent per annum (2.67%). That difference represents a growth rate in the developing world that is 174% greater than the growth in the total global population.<sup>10</sup>



Source: World Urbanization Prospects 2001

At the same time that the urban population is expanding, the growth rate of the rural population is shrinking. It is estimated that between now and 2030 the rural population of the less developed regions will grow at only about 0.1 per cent per annum.<sup>11</sup> As most of these urban dwellers will be poor, it should be obvious that effective urban policies could go a long way in contributing to global reductions in urban poverty incidence.

There are marked differences in the existing level and rate of urbanization among the major areas of the less developed portions of the world. The Latin American and Caribbean region is presently highly urbanized: seventy-five per cent of its population now lives in cities. Asia and Africa reflect only half as much urbanization: with 37% and 38% of the population living in urban places, respectively.<sup>12</sup> There are therefore geographical delays in one and the same process of the global urban transition.



Photo: Thierry Geyssels for the Nairobi River Basin Project, UNEP

**Africa** has the world's highest urbanization rates with an annual average of urban growth of 4.0%, almost two times faster than Latin America and Asia. Currently, 37% of the total population in the continent lives in cities and by 2030 the urban population is expected to rise to 53% of the total population.<sup>13</sup> These current trends on population and human settlement growth defy the belief, almost an aphorism, that "Africa is the least urbanized continent in the world", the continent has overtaken Asia with a slight margin.<sup>14</sup> This high rate of urbanization implies that main cities are growing at 3 to 4 per cent per annum. Besides this, estimates and projections show that secondary cities continued to grow most rapidly – in nearly all cases much faster than primate, capital or other large cities. Consequently, over the next two decades around 87 per cent of the population growth in Africa will take place in urban areas.

Urban areas in **Asia** today account for 39% of the total population in the continent, and it is estimated that in the year 2030, 55 per cent of the population will live in cities. Nevertheless, two out of three inhabitants from the Western part of Asia will live in urban areas.<sup>15</sup> An average urban growth rate of about 2.7 per cent per year is nearly 27 per cent greater than the global average (2.11%), and the absolute number of total Asian urban residents is nearly triple that in the highly industrialized countries.<sup>16</sup>

**Latin America** and the **Caribbean** is the most urbanized region in the developing world with 75 per cent of its people living in cities. It has an urban/rural population ratio similar to that of the highly industrialized countries. About half of Latin America's poor, 113 million people, live in urban areas.<sup>17</sup> The urban population in the region as a whole is projected to reach 84 per cent of its total population by 2030. This proportion will be slightly higher in South America (87.9%) than in the Caribbean<sup>18</sup> (refer to Box 2 "Mega-cities and slum incidence").

*"The Latin American and Caribbean region is presently highly urbanized: seventy-five per cent of its population now lives in cities."*


The increase of the urban population in **Oceania** is likely to be even smaller than in the previous region, rising from 70 per cent to 74 per cent by 2030. In a similar vein, the **European** and **Northern American** urbanized population proportions are predicted to also grow slightly from 75 and 77 per cent, respectively, to 83 per cent and 84 per cent in the same time frame. In most post-modern economies, the urban transformation has nearly been completed. Therefore, the cities in this part of the world no longer deal with the effects of rapid urbanization but rather with a combination of other demographic issues.<sup>19</sup> The urban population in the countries with **economies in transition** is envisaged to approach 78 per cent of its projected total population by 2020. The urban share of total population ranges from 40 per cent in most of the Central Asian Republics to nearly 75 per cent in Russia, about the same for the post-modern economies and Latin American countries.<sup>20</sup>

## Box 2: Mega-cities and slum incidence

*Mega-cities are primarily a phenomenon of the developing world. The combination of high population density amid poverty and limited resources makes an environment which favors the rapid growth of slum areas.*


- Defining a mega-city is clearly arbitrary due to the fact that the population size, which distinguishes mega-cities from other urban areas, varies over time. In the past, the city of Rome, with its over 1 million inhabitants, was a mega-city, while today, 348 cities would be considered mega-cities using the same parameter.
- In 1970s, the UN defined a mega-city as one agglomeration with a threshold of 10 million people. In 1975, there were five large cities in the world with a population above this threshold. The combined number of inhabitants in these cities accounted for 68.1 million people that represented 4.4% of the world's urban population: Tokyo (19.8), New York (15.9), Shanghai (11.4), Mexico City (11.2) and Sao Paolo (10), the latter three of which were located in developing countries.

WORLD MEGA-CITIES IN 1975




- At present, there are 19 mega-cities in the world with a total population of over 275 million and 8.8% of the world's urban population, four of which are from the developed part of the world: New York (16.6), Los Angeles (13.1), Tokyo (26.4) and Osaka (11). The other 15 mega-cities are from the developing world: Mexico City (18.1), Mumbai (18.1), Sao Paolo (17.8), Shanghai (17), Lagos (13.4), Calcutta (12.9), Buenos Aires (12.6), Dhaka (12.3), Karachi (11.8), Delhi (11.7), Jakarta (11), Metro Manila (10.9), Beijing (10.8), Rio de Janeiro (10.6) and Cairo (10.6).

WORLD MEGA-CITIES IN 2000



- Based on world urbanization prospects, the projection of the urban population in 2015 exhibits a dramatic increase in the number of mega-cities to 23. The combined population of all these agglomerations will reach 9.6 per cent of the world's urban population, accounting for slightly over 374 million people. Nearly 85 per cent of this growth will occur in the mega-polis from the developing regions: Mumbai (26.1), Lagos (23.2), Dhaka (21.1), Sao Paolo (20.4), Karachi (19.2), Mexico City (19.2), Jakarta (17.3), Calcutta (17.3), Delhi (17.3), Metro Manila (16.8), Shanghai (14.8), Buenos Aires (14.1), Cairo (13.8), Istanbul (12.5), Beijing (12.3), Rio de Janeiro (11.9), Tianjin (10.7), Hyderabad (10.5) and Bangkok (10.1).
- There is currently an extremely rapid displacement of developed country cities on the list of the world's largest cities by those in developing countries.

WORLD MEGA-CITIES IN 2015



Source: World Urbanization Prospects, 2002.

- The rapid trend of urban growth exhibited implies that mega-cities are primarily a phenomenon of the developing world. Growth of this scale and trend will have severe consequences for the quality of life and surrounding environment. The combination of high population density amid poverty and limited resources makes the developing world's mega-city an environment which favors the rapid growth of slum areas.

Source: UN-HABITAT, "The State of the World's Cities", 2001. UN, World Urbanization Prospects, 2001.

## 2.2 The Urbanization of Poverty

Poverty in the developing world, a phenomenon that has for long been uniquely associated with rural areas, has increasingly become urbanized. Depending on the individual countries and cities, between 40 and 80 per cent of urban dwellers in the world are living in poverty, with very little or absolutely no access to shelter, basic urban services and social amenities.

Urbanization in these countries raised red flags, particularly because of an increasing number and proportion of city residents who live in slums in the core historic part of cities and in the peri-urban areas. There are very few global estimates on urban poverty. Evidence suggests that it will continue increasing in most developing countries subject to structural adjustment problems,<sup>21</sup> spatial and institutional mismanagement, economic mistakes and the poor performance of formal housing and basic service delivery programmes. Empirical evidence suggests that the proportion of urban poor will increase faster than the urban population growth, provoking a substantial increase in the slum incidence. In a rather moderate projection, it is estimated that by the year 2020, the current 30 per cent level of urban poverty in the world could reach 45 to 50 per cent of the total population living in cities, that is 381 to 455 million households, as compared to 128 million households in 2000, a growth that represents 297 to 355 per cent increase in absolute numbers.<sup>22</sup>

Poverty in cities of the developing world will be characterized by, among others, the following features:<sup>23</sup>

- large and growing backlogs in delivery of basic services to urban residents as demand outstrips institutional capacity and financial resources;
- the worsening state of access to adequate shelter with security of tenure, resulting in severe overcrowding, homelessness and environmental health problems;
- increased vulnerability to environmental health problems, environmental shocks and natural disasters;
- increasing intra-city inequality, manifested in stark residential segregation, multiplying violence impacting disproportionately on women and the poor themselves;
- lack of participation of communities in decision-making processes and implementing activities;
- vulnerable sectors among women, children and youth.

Urbanization of poverty is concomitant to the urbanization of the overall population. According to current trends and projections, the urbanization of poverty per region could be summed-up as follows:

It was in the late eighties that the absolute number of urban poor in **Latin**

**America** surpassed the number of rural poor. Indeed, between 1970 and 1990, the poor population in cities and towns increased from 44 million to 115 million, while the number of rural poor increased from 75 million to 80 million.<sup>24</sup> Due to the large concentration of urban residents in Latin America, poverty in cities and towns is more pronounced there than in other developing regions. There is no doubt that poverty is urbanizing in the region: since 1986 until 2002 out of 45 million additional poor 43 live in cities.

According to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), in the 1990s both relative and absolute poverty ("indigence") was characterized in Latin America by a general trend of reduction. However, at the end of the decade, this trend reversed in several countries. The estimated percentage of poor people in 1997 (43.5 %) reduced by nearly five per cent when compared with that for 1990. On the other hand, extreme poverty declined from 22.5 per cent in 1990 to 18.5 per cent in 1999. This achievement was not matched by a similar variation in absolute terms, since the number of poor people increased to nearly 11 million in the same decade. In the last two years, poverty trends have continued to decline significantly due to a slow down in the world's economic situation.<sup>25</sup>

The **African** region has experienced high rates of urbanization in an environment of consistent economic decline over the last thirty years with increasing urban impoverishment of the population, especially the poor and marginalised segments. It is estimated that 41 per cent of urban residents live in poverty in the region, with two out of five of these residents living in circumstances deemed to be life and health threatening. The most persistent poverty and widest gap remain in Sub-Saharan Africa. On current trends, it is the only region where the number of people living in extreme poverty will increase by more than 100 million between 1990 and 2015.<sup>26</sup>

In the **Asian** Region the rapid urbanization and the expansion of urban-based economic activities have recently led to very substantial rural-urban migration. The migration process has, to some extent, helped to reduce population pressure on agricultural land and contributed to increasing agricultural productivity and reducing rural poverty. However, the migration has put pressure on urban housing and other services, leading to the development of slums.<sup>27</sup> Poverty in Asia is marked by two significant factors: magnitude and diversity. Close to 900 million or around two-thirds of the world's poor live in this region. Nearly one in three Asians is poor. Within the region, East Asia and the People's Republic of China in particular performed well in reducing poverty until the recent economic crisis reversed some of the earlier gains. Some progress has been made in South Asia, although the depth of poverty reaches similar levels as Sub-Sahara Africa, but on a much larger scale as more than half a billion people are in poverty. Central Asia has been newly exposed to the threat of poverty as many countries undergo difficult transition periods.<sup>28</sup>

Poverty has also risen steeply in the countries of the **Central and Eastern Europe** as they struggle with the transition towards a market economy. Cities that relied heavily on industrial production are experiencing record numbers of unemployed as factories shut down and production curtailed.<sup>29</sup> At an aggregate level, the increase in poverty can be attributed to fall in average real incomes and rises on income inequality. While average real incomes initially declined in all transition economies, developments in income inequality have differed dramatically across the region. Measures of inequality point to an increase of about 25 per cent in Central Europe and of almost 100 per cent in several other transitional economies, including Bulgaria, Russia and Ukraine.<sup>30</sup> In North America and Western Europe, most of the population, and thus most of the poverty, has been concentrated in urban areas since the beginning of the century.



UNEP/UN-HABITAT Nairobi River Basin Project

## NOTES

- 8 UN-HABITAT, *The State of the World's Cities*, Nairobi, 2001, p. 11.
- 9 United Nations (2002), "World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision, Data Tables and Highlights", Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat, 20 March 2002, ESA/P/WP.173, page 1.
- 10 These facts and projections were taken from the Millennium Project, Task Force on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers, Background Paper, New York 2003. They are based on two reports from the UN Population Division: *The World at Six Billion* and *World Urbanization Prospects*.
- 11 By way of contrast, the urban population of the more developed regions is expected to increase very slowly, passing from 0.9 billion in 2000 to 1 billion in 2030. Ibid.
- 12 United Nations (2002), *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision, Data Tables and Highlights*, Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat, New York, 2001.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 López M. Eduardo, In: ECOSOC Report on Poverty in Africa, RoAAS, UN-HABITAT, 2001.
- 15 *World Urbanization Prospects: 2001*, Ibid.
- 16 UN-HABITAT, *The state of the World's Cities 2001*, p. 14.
- 17 World Bank, *Urban Poverty in Latin America*, Concept Note, Washington, 2002.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Ibid., page 15.
- 20 Ibid., page 17.
- 21 In many countries before structural programmes were completely implemented, governments experienced setbacks on their liberalization policies without achieving social changes in the cities. Refer to the document "From Structural Adjustment Programmes to Poverty Reduction Strategies", López Moreno Eduardo, UN-HABITAT, Nairobi, 2002.
- 22 Extracted from Population Reports, based on the article "Meeting the Urban Challenge", Johns Hopkins University, Volume XXX, Number 4, Fall 2002.
- 23 Mehta Dinesh, "The Urbanization of Poverty", In: *Habitat Debate*, Vol. 6, No. 4, Nairobi, 2000.
- 24 World Bank, *Urban Poverty in Latin America*, op cit.
- 25 CEPAL, *Panorama Social de América Latina 2001-2002*, Chile, Octubre 2002. (Translated to English by the author).
- 26 Child and maternal mortality rates remain extremely high and the spread of epidemic diseases will continue to undermine development efforts. Global Poverty Report "Achieving the Millennium Development Goals in Africa: Progress, Prospects and Policy Implications", prepared by the African Development Bank, WB in collaboration with the IMF, July 2002
- 27 ESCAP, United Nations, *Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific*, New York, 2003, p. 258.
- 28 World Bank/IMF, "Global Poverty Report", G8, Okinawa Summit, July 2000.
- 29 International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations, "Unemployment Threatens World Cities", Web page, 1996.
- 30 World Bank/IMF, "Global Poverty Report", op cit.

## 3 THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

### 3.1 The Global Conferences and the MDGs

In the 1990s, various UN Global Conferences drew up a number of important political global development statements, agendas, goals and targets (e.g. The “Habitat Agenda”). The list of these goals and targets became known as the “International Development Targets” (IDTs). In September 2000, 147 Heads of State and Governments – and 191 nations in total – adopted the Millennium Declaration. The Declaration outlines peace, security and development concerns, including environment, human rights and governance. The Declaration mainstreams a set of inter-connected and mutually reinforcing development goals into a global agenda. The International Development Targets (IDT) and the Development Goals contained in the Millennium Declaration are similar but also, in some respect, are different. Recently, the sets have been merged under the designation of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDGs, which incorporate the IDTs, synthesize the goals and targets for monitoring human development.

*A list of 18 targets and more than 40 indicators corresponding to these goals ensure a common assessment and appreciation of the status of the MDGs at the global, national and local levels.*



### 3.2 The “Cities without Slums” Target and UN-HABITAT

In order to assist Member States realize the goals of the Millennium Declaration (eight goals) the United Nations System has set numerical targets for each goal (refer to Box 3). Furthermore, it has selected appropriate indicators to monitor progress on the goals and attain corresponding targets. A list of 18 targets and more than 40 indicators corresponding to these goals ensure a common assessment and appreciation of the status of the MDGs at the global, national and local levels.<sup>31</sup>

The United Nations System assigned UN-HABITAT the responsibility to assist governments monitor and gradually attain the “Cities without Slums” Target, also known as “Target 11”. One of the three targets of Goal 7 is to “Ensure Environmental Sustainability”. Target 11 is: “By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers”.

Goal 7, Target 11 comes in response to one of the most pressing challenges of the Millennium. By dealing with the people living in the most depressed physical conditions in the world’s cities, Target 11 is a direct recognition that slums are a development issue which needs to be faced. Slums can not simply be considered as an unfortunate consequence of urban poverty but need to be treated as a major issue and as a *typology in itself to classify human settlements*.

### 3.3 Efforts towards Monitoring the Target 11

In an effort to advance the monitoring of this target, UN-HABITAT has undertaken the task of defining the concept of slums and related indicators, in consultation with a group of experts composed of activists, practitioners, academicians and policy makers with demonstrated experience in urban poverty issues.<sup>32</sup>

Pursuing a two-tiered approach to data collection, analysis and capacity building in this area, UN-HABITAT drafted guidelines and questionnaires to carry out household surveys as part of the Agency’s strive to include the slum settlements as an estimation domain in these instruments. These guidelines offer not only the definitions, but also a hierarchy of indicators at the operational level, and the specific questions to measure them.<sup>33</sup> UN-HABITAT is also establishing working relationships with institutions conducting households surveys in different parts of the world on a regular basis, in order to add-on some questions on sub-city differentials in their mainstream survey instruments.<sup>34</sup>

UN-HABITAT published recently a guide to assist Member States in their monitoring and reporting activities towards attaining the goal of “Cities without Slums”.<sup>35</sup> In addition to this study, Habitat is conducting further analysis on the definition of “significant improvements in the lives of slum dwellers” including the means to measure it. Based on this work, the Agency is also conducting a preliminary study on costing the Millennium Target, taking into account different variables.<sup>36</sup>



### Box 3: MDGs Goals and Targets



#### Scope of Millennium Development Goals and Targets

##### Goal 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger

- Target 1. Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day
- Target 2. Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

##### Goal 2. Achieve universal primary education

- Target 3. Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling

##### Goal 3. Promote gender equality and empower women

- Target 4. Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015

##### Goal 4. Reduce child mortality

- Target 5. Reduce by two thirds the mortality rate among children under five

##### Goal 5. Improve maternal health

- Target 6. Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio

##### Goal 6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases

- Target 7. Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS
- Target 8. Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases

##### Goal 7. Ensure environmental sustainability

- Target 9. Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources

- Target 10. Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water

- Target 11. Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020

##### Goal 8. Develop a global partnership for development

- Target 12. Develop further an open trading and financial system that is rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory. Includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction - nationally and internationally

- Target 13. Address the least developed countries' special needs. This includes tariff- and quota-free access for their exports; enhanced debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries; cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction

- Target 14. Address the special needs of landlocked and small island developing States

- Target 15. Deal comprehensively with developing countries' debt problems through national and international measures to make debt sustainable in the long term


- Target 16. In cooperation with the developing countries, develop decent and productive work for youth

- Target 17. In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries

- Target 18. In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies - especially information and communications technologies

## NOTES

- 31 UN-HABITAT, "Guide to Monitoring Target 11: Improving the Lives of 100 Million Slum Dwellers", Nairobi, 2003
- 32 UN-HABITAT and its partners, who were represented in the Expert Group Meeting organized in Nairobi in October 2002, recognize the fact that under these universally applicable generic concepts and definitions, there are marked local variations, and that each country or city should be allowed to adjust to the given universal framework. UN-HABITAT, "EGM on Urban Indicators", Final Report, Nairobi, November, 2003.
- 33 "Guidelines for Operational definitions for Household Surveys in Cities on Secure Tenure and Slums", UN-HABITAT, unpublished document, Nairobi, 2002.
- 34 Such as Demographic and Health Surveys of USAID, Papfam of AGFUND, FAFO of NORAD surveys, and Population Censuses. The overall number of cities that are being surveyed with both approaches is estimated at 35, if not more.
- 35 The Guide was published in English and posted in the Web in May 2003. French and Spanish versions are being produced.
- 36 Refer to the document "Preliminary Study of UN-HABITAT costing the Millennium Target 11 on Slums", unpublished working document, Nairobi, May 2003.



Although generally regarded as an important aspect of sanitation, the removal or treatment of solid waste by a household has not been widely collected in surveys. In urban areas this is especially critical and for many observers the condition of solid waste disposal is the first impression of an unacceptable living condition.

Photo by Thierry Geenen for the Nairobi River Basin Project UNEP

## 4 METHODOLOGY OF DATA COLLECTION

### 4.1 Concepts and Definitions

UN-HABITAT in close collaboration with the United Nations Statistical Division and the Cities Alliance organized a gathering of experts and other stakeholders from around the globe in Nairobi (October 2002). This Expert Group Meeting (EGM) was called in response to encouragement by the UN Statistical Commission (Session 32)<sup>37</sup> and to improve measurement of the Millennium Development Goals. One purpose of the EGM was to reach a consensus on an operational definition for slum dwellers that would be applied to monitoring the MDG Goal 7.

#### *What is a slum dweller?*

As a result of the EGM a **slum household** is defined as a group of individuals living under the same roof lacking *one or more*<sup>38</sup> of the conditions below:

- Access to improved water
- Access to improved sanitation facilities
- Sufficient-living area, not overcrowded
- Structural quality/durability of dwellings
- Security of tenure



Edmundo Moreno

This is an operational definition that reflects conditions that characterize slums in the world. Through this definition *the concept of slum dweller has been explicitly reduced* excepting their social and economic conditions such as standards of living among different groups of informal settlers, cultural aspects, employment, income and other individual and household characteristics. Based on this definition it was possible to set up operational measurement of slums, using data that is routinely collected by national and sub-national levels in most countries through censuses and surveys.

In keeping with the recommendations of the EGM, UN-HABITAT in collaboration with the African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC) developed and implemented an estimation methodology based principally on the analysis of household survey data. The methodology estimates the country-level number of slum dwellers for the year 2001, and more specifically the proportion of the urban population that is living under slum conditions. This is *the first time over 1 million household records were scanned in order to reach these estimates*. This year then becomes the baseline year for monitoring improvements in the lives of slum dwellers.<sup>39</sup>

The five basic indicators stated above lack the precision of definition necessary to classify a household as slum or non-slum. The precise definitions presented below are the result of comparing UN-HABITAT, UNICEF, and WHO standards that are widely accepted. UN-HABITAT has modified some of the classifiers in consultation with its partners represented in the Expert Group Meeting so that the definitions depict conditions that are deemed satisfactory in the *urban* environment (refer to Box 4).

### 4.2 Estimation Methodology<sup>40</sup>

The estimation procedure is primarily logical rather than mathematical or statistical. The method attempts to classify households into slum and non-slum categories starting with the indicator for access to improved water. The remaining indicators are evaluated in the sequence: access to improved sanitation, overcrowding, durability of dwelling, and security of tenure. This sequence approximates the availability of the data; data on household access to water being the most abundant and data on security of tenure the least. The same estimation procedure was used for each country, but the sources of data varied from country to country.

In developing countries, lack of access to improved water and lack of access to improved sanitation are coincident with the other classifiers for slum dwellers and together account for the identification of most slum dwellers. In developed countries, access to improved water and sanitation is nearly universal and the most significant indicators of slum dwellers are overcrowding and dilapidated dwellings. A household lacking any one of the five indicators is classified as a slum dwelling. The methodology ensured that households were not counted more than once. Individual country estimates were summed to regional and global totals.

## Box 4: Detailed definitions of acceptable urban conditions:

### Access to improved water:

A household is considered to have access to improved drinking water if it has sufficient amount of water (20 litres/person/day) for family use, at an affordable price (less than 10% of the total household income), available to household members without being subject to extreme effort (less than one hour a day for the minimum sufficient quantity), especially to women and children.

- Piped connection to house or plot
- Public stand pipe serving no more than 5 households
- Bore hole
- Protected dug well
- Protected spring
- Rain water collection

### Access to improved sanitation:

A household is considered to have access to improved sanitation, if an excreta disposal system, either in the form of a private toilet or a public toilet shared with a reasonable number of people, is available to household members.

- Direct connection to public sewer
- Direct connection to septic tank
- Pour flush latrine
- Ventilated improved pit latrine.

### Sufficient-living area, not overcrowded

A dwelling unit is considered to provide a sufficient living area for the household members if there are fewer than three people per habitable room. Additional indicators of overcrowding have been proposed: area-level indicators such as average in-house living area per person or the number of households per area; housing-unit level indicators such as the number of persons per bed or the number of children under five per room

may also be viable. However, the number of persons per room has been shown to correlate with adverse health risks and is more commonly collected through household surveys (UN-HABITAT (1998), "Crowding and Health in Low Income Settlements of Guinea Bissau", SIEP Occasional Series No. 1).

- Fewer than 3 persons per room (minimum of four square meter)

### Structural quality/durability of dwellings

A house is considered as "durable" if it is built on a non-hazardous location and has a structure permanent and adequate enough to protect its inhabitants from the extremes of climatic conditions such as rain, heat, cold, and humidity.<sup>41</sup>

- Permanency of Structure
- Permanent building material for the walls, roof and floor
- Compliance of building codes
- The dwelling is not in a dilapidated state
- The dwelling is not in need of major repair
- Location of house (hazardous)
- The dwelling is not located on or near toxic waste
- The dwelling is not located in a flood plain
- The dwelling is not located on a steep slope
- The dwelling is not located in a dangerous right of way (rail, highway, airport, power lines).

### Security of tenure

Secure Tenure is the right of all individuals and groups to effective protection by the State against arbitrary unlawful evictions.<sup>420</sup>

- Evidence of documentation that can be used as proof of secure tenure status
- Either *de facto* or perceived/protection from forced evictions

## 4.3 Process of Slum Dweller Estimation for each Country

The estimation procedure that was utilized is outlined below:

- Desk review of primary data sources for the country (published or electronic).
- Household survey data were preferred when available. The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) or other household data (surveys or census) were sought.<sup>43</sup>
- When household survey data were available the response categories for questions on access to water, access to sanitation, overcrowding, quality of housing and security of tenure were reviewed.
- Where possible the response categories were grouped or interpreted according to EGM definitions of slum dwellers (e.g., not all surveys or censuses use the same categories to define access to water and sanitation in the same way). In practice, accessing the data file using data analysis software did this.
- The number of households not meeting the acceptable criteria was tallied. This was achieved through data analysis so that households were not double counted. If a household had both unacceptable access to improved water and unacceptable access to improved sanitation it was only counted once. Similarly, if a household failed on all five criteria it was counted only once.
- In some instances it was possible to cross reference with alternative estimates or sources or consult other countries with similar characteristics. Many countries in Africa and Asia have done DHS surveys more than once. When these data were available both data files were accessed as a confirmatory measure.
- For some countries no household survey data were available, or the data did not contain the indicators necessary for slum dweller assessment. For these countries an estimation model was calculated based on the information from countries with data. It was determined that the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) was highly correlated with the proportion of slum dwellers. In countries where there were no data the HDI was used to estimate the proportion of slum dwellers (refer to point 5.1).

## Box 5: Example of Slum Dweller Estimation:

Process of Slum Dweller Estimation: adding attributes and avoiding duplication (Illustration using hypothetical data)

Order of Estimation	Indicator	Cumulative % of HH
Step 1	Lack of improved water	20 %
Step 2 'OR'	Lack of improved sanitation	50 %
Step 3 'OR'	Lack of sufficient living area	60 %
Step 4 'OR'	Lack of durable housing	65 %
Step 5 'OR'	Lack of secure tenure	70 %

The operation is a logical 'OR' condition. If any one, any combination of, or all of the indicator conditions are "TRUE" then a household is counted only once as a slum dwelling. The TRUE condition means that the household lacks the attribute identified by the indicator. In practice, *'lack of improved sanitation' was the dominant feature identifying slum households.*



## 4.4 Primary and Secondary Data Sources

Table 1 summarises the primary data sources that were used as per the MDGs regional distribution:

TABLE 1  
SLUM ESTIMATION: PRIMARY DATA SOURCES

MDG Regions/Sources	DHS	MICS	JMP/PAHO*	Other/census	Total
Africa	63	26	14	22	125
Asia	17	13	6	15	51
Latin America	20	7	15	48	90
Oceania	1	-	14	3	18
Europe	5	8	7	10	30
North America	-	-	-	2	2
World	106	54	56	100	316

### Secondary Data Sources:

- United Nations Statistics Division Housing Statistics
- WHO/UNICEF Water and Sanitation Assessment 2000 Report
- UN-HABITAT Global Report on Human Settlements
- American Housing Survey 2001
- Housing and Land Survey 1998, Japan, Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications.
- National reports.

## 4.5 Data Limitations

Table 2 summarizes the data limitations that were encountered in the collection of information as per the five indicators:

**TABLE 2**  
**SLUM ESTIMATION: DATA LIMITATIONS**

• Access to improved water:
- Good coverage at household level, but based on rural definitions
- Lack of some categories
- No information on shared public tap
- No distinction between protected and not protected well
- Different reference dates
• Housing durability:
- Fair coverage in the household surveys for African, Asian and Latin American countries
- Lack of some categories in some surveys such as wall and roof
- No information has been given on the conditions of dwelling used for American and European countries
• Access to adequate sanitation:
- Good coverage at household level, but based on rural definitions
- Lack of some categories
- No information on shared toilet
- No information on latrine covered or not
- No information on pit latrine versus improved latrine
- Different reference dates
• Sufficient living area:
- Fair coverage in the household surveys for African, Asian and Latin American countries
- A model has been developed in the UN-HABITAT to estimate overcrowding levels
• Security of Tenure:
- Very weak coverage in the household surveys for all regions
- Tenure status (own or rent) is not a reliable indicator of secure tenure

Only those survey and census data that are well documented and considered valid were included in the estimation. Some surveys were not considered valid because their classification of facilities has inadequate detail or the categories are not comparable with other surveys. Where no valid survey or census points were available, UNICEF/WHO's publications were used. Where no data or publications were available the missing value estimation procedure was followed using the Human Development Index (HDI). Annex 1 presents the general limitations of the data and the missing value estimation.



Photo by Thierry Geenen for the Nairobi River Basin Project, UNEP

# NOTES

- 37 United Nations (2001), Statistical Commission Report on the thirty-second session (6-9 March 2001), Economic and Social Council, Official Records, 2001, Supplement No. 4, New York, p. 5: "Encouraged Habitat to convene, in consultation with the United Nations Statistics Division, an expert group meeting to evaluate existing methodologies and data-collection and dissemination instruments, as well as concepts and sources of city statistics;" and "Recognized the work on the development of more dynamic city indicators on such topics as environment, urban poverty and informal sector economic activities, which would also provide for targeting differentials within a city."
- 38 According to the situation in a specific city this definition may be locally adapted. For example, in Rio de Janeiro living area is insufficient for both the middle classes and the slum population and is not a good discriminator. It could either be omitted, or it could be formulated as two or more of the conditions such as overcrowding and durability of housing.
- 39 Monitoring improvements in the lives of slum dwellers for the MDG target 11 is based on these five basic indicators. Specific studies and analysis could include additional qualitative indicators.
- 40 Extracts from the slum estimation methodology were taken from the APHRC report.
- 41 Durability of housing will manifest itself in various ways in different cities. For example, in Nairobi a non-durable house may be made of a patchwork of tin, cardboard, plastic sheets; while in Moscow it could be a dilapidated condominium. Considerable variability in local definition is allowed. For the estimation procedure the building materials for the roof, walls and/or the floor measure the durability of housing. In some context an earthen floor is an indicator of a slum dwelling.
- 42 Secure tenure can be made evident through formal or informal mechanisms in codified law and in customary law. In its most formal presentation, secure tenure is based on a land registration system where title deeds or lease agreements are registered with the authorities. Less formal security of tenure is more commonly found. It is recognized that informal customary secure tenure practice may also offer effective protection against arbitrary eviction.
- 43 For instances, in Japan the Housing and Land Survey 1998 was used. In the USA, the American Housing Survey 2001 was the source of the estimate. In Europe, reports on housing statistics were the basis for the estimation.

UN-HABITAT and its partners are refining questions on access to improved water and improved sanitation that will begin to appear in various household surveys in the coming years.



Topham Picturepoint

## 5 DATA ANALYSIS: PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

### 5.1 General Aspects

#### *High correlation between slum-dwellers and Human Development Index*

An obvious observation from our database is that there does not seem to be a relationship between the size of the country, in terms of population, and the incidence of slums. Precarious settlements are strongly influenced by the stage of development of countries and their level of poverty. Although the United Nations Human Development Index (HDI) is not based on cities exclusively, it correlates strongly with the proportion of slums in cities and towns in countries. Indeed, the higher is the percentage of informal settlers in a country, the lower is the HDI and, on the contrary, the higher the human development index the lower the proportion of slum residents. The HDI is a composite index that integrates three development indicators: per capita GDP, longevity, and educational attainment.<sup>44</sup>



Bernd Decker

rural and poverty trends, urban poverty as a proportion of total poverty is clearly increasing. In India, for instance, poverty in cities and towns rose from around 15 per cent in the early 1960s to 25 per cent in mid-1990s.<sup>47</sup> A similar trend is also observed in eight countries that represent two-thirds of the developing world's population: Bangladesh, China, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, and Colombia.<sup>48</sup>

Based on the Bretton Woods assumption that 30 per cent of the world's total urban population are poor, it is estimated that 858 million people of the 2.8 billion urban inhabitants are living in poverty. This proportion equates to the total slum population of our study that in 2001 represented nearly 924 million people. However, homogenizing the urban poor in the world through a standard percentage (30%) masks poverty asymmetries in countries and regions. In fact, sub-Saharan Africa and Asia account for more than 75 per cent of the world's urban poverty, a percentage that is consistent with the figure obtained through the slum counting exercise.

#### *A Regional dimension of slum indicators*

##### **Access to water**


Based on relative weights of two of the main contributing factors of slums (lack of water and lack of improved sanitation) for which there are relatively good data for all countries, sanitation seems to be the major contributor to the number of slum-dwellers in most of the regions. Oceania is the only region, which has a higher percentage of the urban population living without improved access to water than those living without access to improved sanitation service.

Table 3 suggests that in the developing regions in 2001, there were 168 million urban dwellers (8.3 per cent of the world's urban population) unserved with improved provision for water – 44.6 million in Africa, 28.7 million in Latin America and the Caribbean and 93.5 million in Asia. It is clear from this table that there are important variations in the level of access to improved water in the Asia region: 29.8 million lack this service in Eastern Asia, 31.2 million in South-central Asia, 20.2 million in South-eastern Asia and 11.3 million in Western Asia.

Sub-Saharan Africa is the worst in terms of access to water: 18.1% of the urban population in sub-Saharan Africa lacks adequate water supply compared to 8.3% in the whole of the developing world. Eastern Asia, excluding China, performs the best with only 2.6% of urban population lacking improved water supply.<sup>49</sup>

However, if it were possible to widen the assessment to measure the proportion with access to safe, sufficient supplies, the number of urban dwellers *inadequately served* would be much higher – perhaps as much as four times. This point is made by the UN-HABITAT Water and Sanitation Report (2003), which reviews the quality and extent of provision of water in urban areas, concluding that water provision is very inadequate for large sections of the urban population in developing regions that are classified as having “improved” provision. The document highlights, for instance, that in Kenya 87 per cent of the country's urban population may have had “improved” water supplies by the year 2000, but detailed studies in Kenya's two larger cities, Nairobi and Mombasa show that a

**FIGURE 2**  
CORRELATION BETWEEN PERCENTAGE OF SLUM DWELLERS AND HDI



#### *Urban poverty and slums incidence*

According to the World Bank, the proportion of people living in poverty globally declined from 27 per cent in 1987 to 26 per cent in 1998, although the total number of poor remained almost unchanged at around 1.2 billion.<sup>45</sup> This estimate includes both rural and urban population. The predicament is that international development agencies, world development reports and global poverty studies do not make attempts to disaggregate poverty into urban and rural categories.<sup>46</sup>

In the absence of reliable data sets, it is difficult to make any judgement of the incidence of urban poverty. However, in those countries that have good data on

much smaller proportion has safe, sufficient water.<sup>50</sup> In Pakistan, it was reported that in 2000, 96 per cent of the urban population had improved water supplies. However, the same document argues that studies conducted on the water conditions in Karachi and Faisalabad indicate that half of the population in the former city and about two-thirds in the latter were lacking adequate drinkable water.<sup>51</sup>

Official statistics on “improved” provision of water suggest that it is only a minority of urban dwellers who are unserved, even in low-income nations in Africa, Asia and Latin America. But there is strong evidence that hundred of million of urban dwellers who are said by government statistics or household surveys to have improved provision for water have very inadequate provision, which also means very large health burden from water-related diseases.<sup>52</sup> For instance, in demographic and health surveys (which are the main sources of data on provision of water and sanitation in many low-income nations) no information is gathered about the time that households spend accessing shared, communal or public facilities or the frequency with which these facilities are cleaned. If we take “adequate” water to mean a regular piped supply available within the home or in the yard, at least half of the urban population of sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia has inadequate provision (and perhaps substantially more than this).<sup>53</sup>

A UNICEF/WHO Report shows that in 2000, some 1.1 billion people – one-sixth of the world’s population – still lacked access to improved drinking water. The majority of these people live in Asia and Africa. In Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, two out of five people do not have access to improved sources.<sup>54</sup> Unfortunately, this definition does not segregate urban and rural populations.

#### Access to sanitation

Sanitation coverage data is not available specifically for urban slum dwellers. Globally, 2.4 billion people in the world are still without access to basic sanitation, and notably in Asia over 80 per cent are faced with this problem.<sup>55</sup>

According to our slum estimate, by 2001, 30.7 per cent of the world’s urban population had no access to improved sanitation, that is 620 million people – 145 million in Africa, nearly 79 million in Latin America and the Caribbean region and 381.8 in Asia (refer to Table 3).

The data in Table 3 shows that 56.7% of the urban population in sub-Saharan Africa lacks adequate sanitation compared with 30.7% for the developing world and 21.2% for the whole world.<sup>56</sup> It is clear that much of the urban population in Latin America and the Caribbean region are better served with sanitation (19.7 per cent lack this service) than are the urban populations in Africa and Asia. In this latter region, there are very large variations in the extent of access to improved sanitation between sub-regions and countries: on one extreme, are Eastern and South-central Asia, with more than one-third of their urban population (32.7 and 34.3 per cent, respectively) lacking improved sanitation, and South-eastern and Western Asia, with 14.6 and 18.2 per cent without improved sanitation service on the other. At country level, Nepal and Afghanistan are the worst served nations, since large numbers of the urban population do not have this facility (nearly 80 per cent and 92.2 per cent, respectively).

The UN-HABITAT Report on Water and Sanitation (2003) indicates that the same gap between the proportion of urban populations with improved sanitation and the proportion with safe, convenient sanitation is evident in the developing regions. Indeed, if we take “adequate” sanitation to mean an easily maintained toilet in each person’s home with provision for hand-washing and the safe removal and disposal of toilet wastes, a very large proportion of the urban population in most low-income nations is likely to have inadequate provision. In Africa’s larger cities the only provision for sanitation for most of the urban population are latrines that households dig themselves, or public latrines which are often dirty and difficult to access.<sup>57</sup> There are a few cities that have a relatively good provision, however, in most small urban centres, there is little or no public provision. Thus, it is unlikely that nearly half of the sub-Saharan urban population have access to sanitation that is adequate in terms of convenience and the safe disposal of human excreta.<sup>58</sup> This may also be the case for the other regions.

**TABLE 3**  
**DEVELOPING REGIONS: PER CENT OF URBAN POPULATION LACKING ACCESS TO IMPROVED WATER AND SANITATION**

Sub-region	Urban Population (%)	% of Urban Classified Slum	Population with Lack of Improved water (%)	Population with lack of improved water	Population with Lack of Improved sanitation (%)	Population with lack of improved sanitation
Northern Africa	52	28.2	3.8	287,633	19.12	1,447,250
Sub-Saharan Africa	34.6	71.9	18.1	4,182,041	56.7	13,100,648
Latin America and the Caribbean (including Bermuda)	75.8	31.9	7.2	2,875,572	19.7	7,867,884
Eastern Asia	39.1	36.4	5.6	2,985,819	32.7	17,435,051
Eastern Asia excluding China (optional)	77.1	25.4	2.6	159,263	23.8	1,457,869
South-central Asia	30	58	6.9	3,122,139	34.3	15,520,201
South-eastern Asia	38.3	28	10	2,028,540	14.6	2,961,668
Western Asia	64.9	33.1	9.1	1,136,981	18.2	2,273,962
Oceania (excluding New Zealand and Australia)	26.7	24.1	18	37,296	9.5	19,684
Total	40.9	43	8.3	16,815,285	30.7	62,084,219
World	47.7	31.6			21.2	

Thus, by 2001, around two-thirds of the Asian urban population had access to improved sanitation, but a much lower proportion had access to adequate sanitation. Whereas if higher standards are set than those used to define “improved provision of sanitation”, the proportion of the population inadequately served in Latin America and the Caribbean increase substantially.


### Where do the slum dwellers live?

There is a general assumption that capital cities of the developing world concentrate the majority of slum dwellers. A common observation in low-income economies indicates that the larger the city, the higher the proportion of slum dwellers. However, the analysis of a certain number of selected African and Asian countries where the incidence of slums is high (more than 80 and 50 per cent, respectively) reveals that slums can proliferate both in the primary city and/or in the intermediate ones. In Ethiopia, for instance, slums represented 99.4 per cent of the total urban population in 2001 and Addis Ababa concentrated only one-fourth of this population; the rest of the slum population was therefore distributed in and around other eight to ten urban centres. In Chad, the figures were quite similar (99.4 per cent of slums) with N'Djamena, the capital city, accounting for a little bit more than one-third of the urban population. While in other nations, more than fifty per cent of the country's urban population lived in the capital: 60% in Luanda, 73.5% in Bissau and 82.9% in Kigali. A total slum population of 87.9 per cent in the latter country means that virtually all informal settlers were concentrated in the capital (refer to Figure 3).

These findings are confirmed in Asia: Kabul accommodated about half of the country's urban population (54.5) with the highest proportion of slum incidence that reached 98.5. It is possible to infer that around half of the slum population in this country was living in secondary cities. A similar phenomenon is observed in Nepal that had a slum population that reached 92.4 per cent in 2001, and Kathmandu, the capital city, housed only one-fourth of the total urban population. Whereas Vientiane hosted 62.2 per cent of the country's urban residents, having a total slum population of around 66.1 per cent, which means that a high proportion of slum dwellers are living in the capital city (refer to Figure 4).


These figures imply that the slum dwellers are living in capital cities, mid-size urban areas and small urban centres. Although one does not expect to see the crowding, pollution and unsanitary areas that characterize the slums in the large cities, nor the enormous pressure over land, there is evidence that service deliv-

**FIGURE 3**  
PROPORTION OF SLUM DWELLERS TO TOTAL URBAN POPULATION AND PROPORTION OF URBAN POPULATION LIVING IN THE CAPITAL CITY: AFRICA



Source: UN-HABITAT & World Urbanization Prospects 2001

**FIGURE 4**  
PROPORTION OF SLUM DWELLERS TO TOTAL URBAN POPULATION AND PROPORTION OF URBAN POPULATION LIVING IN THE CAPITAL CITY: ASIA



Source: UN-HABITAT & World Urbanization Prospects 2001


ery in small and medium size cities is significantly poorer than in the bigger cities. UN-HABITAT in its Water and Sanitation Report (2003) demonstrates that analysis of provision for water drawn from demographic and health surveys with sample sizes large enough to compare coverage in urban centres of different sizes suggest that provision for water is worse in smaller urban centres than in the larger cities.<sup>59</sup> Smaller Cities should be considered much more carefully in some key indicators such as infrastructure and reproductive health. Further studies and comparisons are to be conducted, in order to determine infrastructural gaps and other gaps in services and related health factors between small and larger cities.<sup>60</sup>

### Urban growth and slum proliferation


Cities growing faster would be expected to generate more slums. This general assumption is empirically confirmed by the analysis of a certain number of selected countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Based on a sample of 10 countries per region, composed of five with the highest slum prevalence and another five with the lowest proportion of urban slum population, it was determined that over a period of 51 years (1950-2001) urban population growth was a crucial factor for the development of slums. However, some isolated cases are an exception to this general trend. Indeed, as indicated in Figure 5, among fifteen countries having an urban slum population exceeding 50 per cent of the total urban population, the urban growth rate was above three per cent, with a range between 3 and 6 per cent on average. This urban growth can be considered as amongst the highest in the world for developing cities. Belize, with slightly more than 60 per cent of slum dwellers and a growth rate of 2.1 per cent, is the only country that deviates from the pattern.

Whereas, among the countries with the lowest proportion of urban slums in these three regions (less than 15 per cent) the average urban growth rate over the same period (1950-2001) was between a range of 2 to 4 per cent, a percentage that coincides with the average growth rate of most of the regions that are in a demographic transition. Kuwait and Zimbabwe constitute the two exceptions among the selected countries, having extremely high urban population growth above 5 per cent, with a slum population below 5 per cent. In view of these findings, therefore, it is possible to conclude that the urban population growth is among some of the important factors that lead to a high incidence of slum population (refer to Figure 6).

**FIGURE 5**  
HIGH SLUM INCIDENCE AND URBAN GROWTH RATE.



**FIGURE 6**  
LOW SLUM INCIDENCE AND URBAN GROWTH RATE.



Source: Habitat slum estimation (2003). UN World Urbanization Prospects, 2002

### Links between macro economic performance and slum incidence

Slums are most obviously related to insufficient social and economic development. The richer the country (in terms of per capita income and other economic indicators) the lower would be the incidence of slums and, on the contrary, the higher the magnitude of slums in the country the lower would be the gross national income (GNI). A multiple regression analysis proves clearly the significance of this assertion.<sup>61</sup> What is not too clear is the relationship between sound

financial performance and slum reduction, whereby successful macro-economic strategies in poor countries do not necessarily lead to poverty alleviation, especially in urban areas.<sup>62</sup>

Without adequate baseline information it is difficult to know whether things are getting worse or better in some countries undergoing economic growth. There is evidence that over the last decades, some nations have raised public expenditures on social and basic services as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which suggests that there might be an improvement on slum conditions.

However, in some countries this assertion is yet to be proved. For instance, in the Islamic Republic of Iran there had been significant improvements, since its human development and social protection policies in the last 20 years have contributed to achieve virtually universal education and extensive health coverage. According to ESCAP, the Iranian Government distributive strategy through direct transfers and indirect subsidies have reduced significantly the proportion of the population living below the poverty line from 47 per cent in 1978 to about 16 per cent in recent years. Nevertheless, according to the slum indicators, 44.2 per cent of the urban population, or 20 million people, were residing in slums in 2001. This may be an indication that urban poverty is still rampant in this country.

*The poor do not automatically benefit from good “macroeconomic statistics”, compared to the non-poor, particularly in terms of the corresponding improvements in the quality and coverage of public services*

A similar situation is observed in Mozambique, where over the last five years the country achieved annual economic growth rates of around 8 per cent in real terms, in a context of economic and political stabilisation.<sup>63</sup> However, poverty levels remain extremely high and the prevalence of slums is dramatically elevated (94.1 per cent). Sufficient data is not available to determine the evolution of slum incidence over the last few years, and the extent to which the changes that have taken place and the rapid economic growth over these years have influenced trends in the prevalence of informal settlements. There is evidence that since 1994, that coincided with a period of accelerated economic growth, and specially for the years 1997-2001, which experienced a considerable reduction of in the prevalence of poverty (7.3 per cent cumulative),<sup>64</sup> the progression of social and welfare indicators have been rather positive. However, these benefits are highly unequal, and there are clear indications that the Mozambican poor do not automatically benefit from good “macroeconomic statistics”, compared to the non-poor, particularly in terms of the corresponding improvements in the quality and coverage of public services.


Further studies at household level are required to analyse the impact of the structure of growth on the dynamics of poverty. These studies are necessary to determine as well the impact of macroeconomic performance on the slum population in terms of pro-poor targeted programmes, social security, level of access to basic services and income generating resources for poverty reduction of this specific socio-economic stratum.<sup>65</sup>



**TABLE 4**  
**POPULATION OF URBAN SLUM AREAS AT MID-YEAR 2001 (UN-HABITAT) – SUMMARY.**

Major area	Total population (millions)		Total Urban population (millions)		Urban population as (%) of total population		Slum population as (%) of total urban population	Urban slum population (millions)
	1990	2001	1990	2001	1990	2001	2001	2001
World	5,255	6,134	2,286	2,923	43.5	47.7	31.6	924
Developed regions	1,148	1,194	846	902	73.7	75.5	6	54
Developing regions	4,106	4,940	1,439	2,022	35	40.9	43	870
Least Developed Countries	515	685	107	179	20.8	26.2	78.2	140

Sources: 1/ Total and urban population: UN Population Division, *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision*, Table A.1; 2/ Slum percentages: DHS (1987-2001); MICS (1995-2000); WHO/UNICEF JMP (1998-1999).



A **slum household** is defined as a group of individuals living under the same roof lacking *one or more* of the following conditions: access to improved water; access to improved sanitation facilities; sufficient-living area, not overcrowded; structural quality/durability of dwellings and security of tenure. This is an operational definition that reflects conditions that characterize slums in the world.

## MAP 1: URBAN SLUM POPULATION OF THE WORLD

### Global comparison of Slum and Non Slum Population by Region (2001)

#### Box 6: The words that describe the slums\*


The delimitation of what the word “slum” covers is even more complex when one considers the variety of words it has generated in other languages.

The words which describes the slums also incorporate other specific realities, such as in French, the *bidonvilles*, describing precarious settlements made out of iron sheets and tins (bidons).

- In French: Bidonvilles, Taudis, Habitat Précaire, Habitat Spontané.
- In Spanish: Asentimientos Irregulares, Barrio Marginal (Barcelona), Barraca (Barcelona), Conventillos (Quito), Colonias Populares (Mexico), Tugurio and Solares (Lima), Bohios, Cuarterias or Solar (Cuba), Villa Miseria (Colombia).
- In Arabic: Mudun Safi, Lahbach, Brarek, Medina Achouaia, Foundouks and Karyan (Rabat-Sale), Carton, Safeih, Ishash, Galoos and Shammaa (Khartoum), Tanake (Beirut), Aashwa'i and Baladi (Cairo).
- In Russian: Hrushebi, Baraks (Moscow).
- In Portuguese: Favela, Morro, Cortiço, Comunidade, Loteamento.
- In American English: Hood (Los Angeles), Blight areas.
- In other languages: “chawls”/chalis (Ahmedabad, Mumbai), Ahatas (Kanpur), Katras (Delhi), Bustee (Kolkata), Zopadpattis (Maharashtra), “cheris” (Chennai), Katchi Abadis (Karachi), Iskwater, Estero, Eskinita, Looban and Dagat-dagatan (Manila), Umjondolo (Zulu, Durban), Watta, Pelpath, Udukku or Pelli Gewal (Colombo); Museques (Angola), Chereka Bete (Ethiopia).

Annex 2 describes the types of “slums” and the words used in 30 cities world-wide.

\* Expert Group Meeting, Background Paper 1, UN-HABITAT, October 2002.




## 5.2 Urban Slums of the World: Global Figures

A key conclusion of the preliminary estimations suggests that more than 920 million people, or slightly less than a third of the world's total urban population, lived in slums in 2001. 43 per cent of the urban population of all Developing Regions combined lived in slums, in comparison to 6 per cent in Developed Regions and 78.2 per cent in the Least Developed Countries (refer to Table 4).<sup>66</sup>

Although dividing the world into the simple geography of continents can lead to general statements and sweeping generalizations, providing global figures allows us to visualize the world's geography of poverty. In general terms, within the **Developing Regions**, the African Continent had the largest proportion of the urban population resident in slums in 2001 (60.9 per cent). Asia and Pacific Region had the second largest proportion of the urban population living in these precarious settlements (42.1 per cent) while Latin America and the Caribbean

slum dwellers population was the third largest with 31.9 per cent. Relatively, Oceania had the lowest proportion with 24.1 per cent (refer to Map 1).<sup>67</sup>

With respect to absolute numbers of urban slum dwellers aggregated at continental level, Asia and the Pacific Region dominate the global picture, having a total of 554 million informal settlers in 2001 (excluding China), which accounted for 63.3 per cent of the total slum population in the Developing Regions. Africa had a total of 187 million inhabitants living in slums, which represented 21.39 per cent of the slums dwellers in the same Region; while Latin American and Caribbean had 128 million, or 14.6 per cent of the slum population from the developing region. Oceania had only 5 million inhabitants living in slums (refer to Table 5 and Figure 7).




**TABLE 5**  
**POPULATION OF SLUM AREAS IN DEVELOPING REGIONS AT MID-YEAR 2001 – DETAIL**

Region	Total population (millions)		Total Urban population (millions)		Urban population as (%) of the total population		Slum population as (%) of the urban population	Urban slum population (millions)
	1990	2001	1990	2001	1990	2001	2001	2001
World	5,255	6,134	2,286	2,923	43.5	47.7	31.6	924
Developing regions	4,106	4,940	1,439	2,022	35.0	40.9	43.0	874
Africa	619	683	198	307	31.9	44.9	60.9	187
Latin America and the Caribbean	440	527	313	399	71.7	75.8	31.9	128
Asia (excluding China)	3,040	3,593	928	1,313	30.5	36.5	42.1	554
Oceania	6	8	1	2	23.5	26.7	24.1	5

# AFRICA

MAP 2: PREVALENCE OF SLUMS IN AFRICA PER COUNTRY




## 5.3 Slum Dwellers by MDG Regions

Here the slum dwellers estimate is presented following the regional aggregates proposed by the United Nations Statistical Division (UNSD) and the Population Division (PD) based on regions, sub-regions and countries. This classification has been done within the framework of the MDGs, in order to provide regional estimates that are comparable in an inter-regional basis.<sup>68</sup> This classification permits a higher disaggregation per sub-regions and therefore a more accurate analysis of slum incidence per development areas (refer to Table 6 'a' and 'b').


In **Africa** 61 urban residents out of 100 were living in slums in 2001, being 54 from sub-Saharan Africa and 7 from Northern Africa. In the latter sub-region three countries had a slum incidence that in proportion represented one-third of their total urban population: Egypt (39.9), Libya (35.2) and Morocco (32.7). Notable is sub-Saharan Africa, where 71.9 per cent of the urban population is estimated to be living in these informal settlements. This unfortunate reality is in line with findings on other human development and poverty related indicators in the sub-region.<sup>69</sup>

New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) analysts estimate that by 2015 a staggering 345 million people in Africa will live in extreme poverty – US\$1 a day or less – up from 100 million when the Millennium Development Goals were first set.<sup>70</sup> If present trends continue, Africa may be the only continent where problems of poverty, urban as well as rural, will continue to worsen in the following twenty years.<sup>71</sup> Several factors explain this dramatic growth of poverty, namely: the lack of clear pro-poor policies; poor governance and the lessening of economic growth,<sup>72</sup> among others.<sup>73</sup> Poverty will continue to concentrate in cities if national and local governments do not address this policy dimension. Presently, most of the African cities are characterized by rising urban poverty, unsustainable environmental practices and social exclusion of the poor. In some urban centres, the inhabitants have virtually lost faith in the ability of municipal and city governments to provide them with a clean, efficient, safe and affordable environment to live.

**TABLE 6A**  
DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL AND URBAN POPULATION BY DEVELOPING  
REGIONS 2001 (MID-YEAR).



**TABLE 6B**  
DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN POPULATION BY SLUM AND NON-SLUM,  
2001 (MID-YEAR)




**TABLE 7**  
URBAN AND SLUM POPULATION IN AFRICA

Major area	Total population (millions)		Total Urban population (millions)		Urban population as (%) of the total population		Slum population as (%) of the urban population	Urban slum population (millions)
	1990	2001	1990	2001	1990	2001	2001	2001
Northern Africa	118	146	58	76	48.7	52.0	28.2	21
Sub-Saharan Africa	501	667	140	231	27.9	34.6	71.9	166
Africa	619	813	198	307	31.9	37.7	60.9	187



Eduardo Moreno

**FIGURE 8**  
**AFRICA'S POPULATION GROWTH 1950-2020**



Source: World Urbanization Prospects 2001

According to the patterns depicted on the Figure 8, both urban and rural population will continue to increase in the coming years in Africa. If the growth rates of the late 1990s persist, by 2025, city dwellers will outnumber those living in rural areas, and the continent's urban population will almost treble in size.<sup>74</sup>

Despite the efforts initiated to expand basic services to urban slum areas in some African cities, improvements have not kept pace with a rapidly increasing urban population. There is no evidence that this pattern will change, and most of the sub-Saharan population will continue to live with inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene, which is a fundamental manifestation of poverty. In 2001, 40 countries out of 51 in the sub-region had more than half of their urban population living in slums also known locally, among other names, as *Bidonvilles*, *Fondouks*, *Hurumas*, *Vijijis*. According to current trends, it is likely that the number of nations with slum population greater than 50 per cent of their total urban population will continue to grow, if no action is taken.

In 15 LDCs in this sub-region the non-slum population represented less than 10 per cent of the total urban residents in 2001. In Chad and Ethiopia virtually *all the population living in cities and towns is considered to be a slum household in statistical terms*, which means that all individuals living in the same roof lack *one or more* of the five indicators that characterize slums (refer to the methodology in Chapter 4). In general, this information is consistent with global poverty monitoring indices (per capita income and consumption expenditure) that classify these two countries as being among the bottom of the LDCs. However, according to the corresponding Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP), 45.5 per cent of the Ethiopian population (33 per cent urban)<sup>75</sup> and 54 per cent of the Chadian population (60 per cent urban)<sup>76</sup> are estimated to be below the poverty line. Therefore, the determinant of slum incidence in these two countries, as in the rest of the developing world, is strongly related to poor or no access to adequate sanitation and not to income poverty per se.<sup>77</sup> It is clear that the current strategies to treat poverty (e.g. PRSP) tend to over-emphasize income dimensions. Indeed, there has been limited progress in deepening and developing country and community-specific analysis and in understanding of poverty<sup>78</sup>, particularly urban poverty.

Out of 49 LDCs in the world<sup>79</sup>, 34 are located in Africa. In these countries, 82 per cent of the total urban population were living in slums in 2001 while only 72.5 per cent were living in the same type of settlements in the rest of the LDCs. Hence, among the poorest countries in the world, Africa has in proportion a slightly larger number of informal settlers than other LDCs urban population, of around 8 per cent.<sup>80</sup>

In the last decade, more than one-third of the African LDCs were experiencing armed conflicts. In some of these countries hostilities had been underway for at least 15 years.<sup>81</sup> War not only turns back the development clock, destroying years of effort and labour, it also annihilates social capital, investments, infrastructure and livelihoods, contributing to perpetuate poverty. The erosion of institutional structures render it difficult to cope with the incalculable damages and losses provoked by the uprooting of the rural population and the destruction of the economic and social fabric. According to our estimate, 77.7 per cent of the total urban population lived in slums in these war-torn countries. *A proportion that is definitively under-estimated*, due to the fact that the conflict makes it extremely difficult to keep track of internal displacements of populations, and the rate of change of the urban population, including the increase of urban poverty.<sup>82</sup>

In most of these environments, regional urbanization prospects and poverty related indicators can not be reconciled with the national studies or studies of particular urban centres. In Angola, for instance, the National Statistic Office estimated that the percentage of the population living in urban areas in 2001 was approximately 60 per cent of the total population.<sup>83</sup> Whereas the UN World Urbanization Prospects indicated for the same year of reference that the percentage of population residing in urban areas was 34.2 per cent, underestimating by almost half the absolute number of urban population, and consequently the number of residents living in *museques*, as slums are known here.<sup>84</sup>

A rather similar phenomenon is observed in Liberia, where, according to a UNDP/UN-HABITAT poverty study, Greater Monrovia showed an increase from .45 million people before the war (1989) to 1.2 million in 1990, concentrating 56 per cent of the total population, while the government data estimated a total urban population of 42 per cent for the same year.<sup>85</sup> The size of urban households had increased to eight while rural households shrunk to four at the country level. The rise of population density led to diminished accommodation and services: in 1998 over 80 per cent of urban dwellers did not have convenient and adequate toilet facilities and access to safe sources of drinking water in their homes.<sup>86</sup> This figure is even higher for the urban poor. In Monrovia, 82.7 per cent of households had three or more persons sleeping in the same bedroom.<sup>87</sup> It is clear, therefore, that the number of slum dwellers in the country (55.7 %) was seriously underestimated in our calculations. These findings are consistent with other studies developed by UN-HABITAT and other partners in post-conflict or on-going conflict environments in the continent, where displacement of population towards cities are so rapid that urban growth projections are unable to reflect the actual situation.<sup>88</sup>



In the absence of reliable data sets, it is difficult to make any judgement of the incidence of urban poverty. However, in those countries that have good data on rural and poverty trends, urban poverty as a proportion of total poverty is clearly increasing.






Photo by Thierry Geenen for the Nairobi River Basin Project, UNEP

# ASIA

MAP 3: PREVALENCE OF SLUMS IN ASIA PER COUNTRY (2001)



**FIGURE 9**  
PROPORTION OF URBAN POPULATION IN ASIA AND SLUM AND NON-SLUM POPULATION




Thirty-six per cent of Asia's 3.5 billion people lived in urban areas in 2001, and more than 42 per cent of the continent's 1.3 billion urban residents lived in slums. Currently, it is estimated that one out of two urban slum dwellers in the world are from Asia (refer to Figure 9). As Table 8 shows, Eastern and South-central Asia dominate the global picture with respect to absolute number of slums in the region, having about 82.2 per cent of the total slum population in 2001 (34.96 and 47.33 per cent, respectively). South-eastern Asia had 10.24 per cent and Western Asia had 7.4 per cent.

**TABLE 8**  
SLUM DISTRIBUTION IN ASIAN SUB-REGIONS

	Total Population (Thousands)	Urban Population (Thousands)	Urban population as (%) of the total population	Slum population as (%) of the urban population	Slum Population (Thousands)	Distribution of Slum Population by sub-regions
Total Asia	3,593,372	1,313,463	36.5	42.2	554,290	100
Eastern Asia	1,364,438	533,182	39.1	36.4	193,824	34.96
South-central Asia	1,506,725	452,484	30.0	58.0	262,354	47.33
South-eastern Asia	529,764	202,854	38.3	28.0	56,781	10.24
Western Asia	192,445	124,943	64.9	33.1	41,331	7.46

**FIGURE 10**  
PROPORTION OF THE URBAN AND SLUM POPULATIONS IN THE ASIAN REGION



**South-central Asia** appears to be the poorest sub-region in the continent, having the greatest incidence of slums in the region (47.3 per cent with only 32 per cent of the total Asian's urban population, refer to Figure 10 and the highest level of prevalence of infant mortality rates and other social indicators.

This high proportion of "*chawls*", *Shanties*, *Adugbo Atiyo*, *Katchi Abadis*, as some slums are known in the region can be explained by the fact that, in absolute numbers, India and Pakistan had 194 million urban slum dwellers, which represent-

ed 73.9 per cent of the total informal population in the sub-region. This could be because South-central Asia is composed of three of the most highly populated LDCs in the world: Afghanistan (22.4 m.), Bangladesh (14 m.), and Nepal (23.5 m.), that along with Bhutan (2 million inhabitants), had an urban population that in 2001 accounted for 23.3 per cent of the total population, with an impressive proportion residing in slums that, in average, reached 86.6 per cent in the same year (Table 9).

**TABLE 9:**  
**LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES IN THE SOUTH-CENTRAL ASIA SUB-REGION**

	Total Population (Thousands)	Urban Population (Thousands)	Urban population as (%) of the total population	Slum population as (%) of the urban population	Slum Population (Thousands)
Afghanistan	22,474	5,019	22.3	98.5	4,945
Bangladesh	140,369	35,896	25.6	84.7	30,403
Bhutan	2,141	158	7.4	44.1	70
Nepal	23,593	2,874	12.2	92.4	2,656
Total LDCs	188,577	43,947	23.3	86.6	38,074

In the post-conflict or on-going conflict countries of the sub-region, non-slum residents represented less than 10 per cent of the total urban population in 2001: Nepal had 7.6 per cent<sup>89</sup> and Afghanistan only 1.5 per cent. Afghanistan is facing a formidable challenge in economic rehabilitation and reconstruction, and in nation-building more generally. Most people in the urban areas live in extreme poverty. According to a UNICEF/WHO household survey 19 per cent of the population had access to safe water and only 7.8 per cent to adequate sanitation in 1999.<sup>90</sup>

In the former Soviet Republics, the changes in policy orientation, economic production and marketing have created considerable economic, and, by extension, social disruption. In Uzbekistan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan the number of slums is higher than 50 per cent if compared to the total urban population of each country (50.7, 56 and 51.8 per cent respectively). There are clear signs that progress with structural reforms in these countries could further increase poverty due to higher unemployment, lower purchasing power and disparities in the distribution of wealth and access to basic services.<sup>91</sup>

The second sub-region with the highest slum population is **East Asia**, accounting for 35 per cent of the continent's population residing in these precarious settlements. However, with the exception of Mongolia, the only country where

more than half of the urban population is living in slums (64.9 per cent)<sup>92</sup>, the rest of the countries in the area are considered as either intermediate or high level income countries.<sup>93</sup> Slum incidence is important in this sub-region because in absolute numbers China itself accounted for 178 million urban slum dwellers, according to the slum indicators. However East Asia has a lower proportion of slums in the continent, having an urban population that accounts for 44.8 per cent of the total Asian urban population, and around one-third of the slum residents (refer to Figure 10).

One tenth of the slum dwellers in the continent are from **Southeast Asia**, converting this sub-region into the third most populated area in terms of urban slum population. However, according to Figure 10, this sub-region's urban population accounts for 14.3 per cent of the total Asian urban population, which means that proportionally inhabitants in this area are better off, since they account for only 10.2 per cent of the urban slum dwellers population. Considering that three LDCs are located in this sub-region (Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic and Myanmar), this low incidence would be rather conspicuous, if one does not take into account that Myanmar has the lowest proportion of slums among all the LDCs in the world. Indeed, according to the slum indicators, this country has only one-fourth of urban slum residents (26.4%) for a total urban population of 13.6 million people (refer to Table 10).

**TABLE 10:**  
**LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN ASIA SUB-REGION**

	Total Population (Thousands)	Urban Population (Thousands)	Urban population as (%) of the total population	Slum population as (%) of the urban population	Slum Population (Thousands)
Cambodia	13,441	2,348	17.5	72.2	1,696
Lao People's Democratic Republic	5,403	1,066	19.7	66.1	705
Myanmar	48,364	13,606	28.1	26.4	3,596
Total LDCs	67,208	17,020	25.3	35.2	5,997

Vietnam is the poorest non-LDC in South-eastern Asia, with a slum incidence reaching 47.4 per cent. According to our estimate, one third of its population has no access to improved sanitation and 19 per cent to safe water. These ratios may be increasing. There are some signs that inequality is widening in recent years after a decade of rapid growth.<sup>94</sup>


In Timor-Leste –the first new nation of this Millennium– the slum population is completely underestimated (only 12 per cent), a fact that is explained by the lack of reliable and up-dated data available in the country. Although three quarters of the people are engaged in agriculture and only 7.5 per cent is considered as urban (0.5 million inhabitants), the capital city and other small urban towns are facing the enormous challenges of post-war reconstruction, after more than 85 per cent of its infrastructure was destroyed during the civil unrest.<sup>95</sup>

**Western-Asia** has the lowest percentage of slum population in the continent (7.5 per cent). However, it is the most heterogeneous sub-region with nine countries where the slum incidence is less than 10 per cent and five where it is more than 50 per cent of their total urban population.<sup>96</sup>

Finally, among the 30 **Landlocked Developing Countries** (LLDCs) in the world, 12 are in the Asia Region, of which seven are considered transitional countries. In general, LLDCs are among the poorest within the developing regions due to their lack of territorial access to the sea, remoteness and isolation, which is compounded by poor infrastructure. Yet, the proportion of urban slums in the Asian transitional LLDCs is relatively low, accounting only for 27.3 per cent of the total urban population.

Urban slum incidence is expected to grow in the continent, because, according to prevailing trends, the urban population will increase from 1.37 billion in 2000 to 2.23 billion in 2020, at which point nearly half Asia population will be living in cities (48 per cent). As depicted in Figure 11, the rural population is forecast to stabilise by 2010, and to decline after 2015, which means that urban population will be growing at around 2.5 per cent every five years.


**FIGURE 11**  
**ASIA'S POPULATION GROWTH 1950-2030**




Source: World Urbanization Prospects 2001

The rural and urban poverty trends and numbers for this region tell us an important history on the relocation of poverty in the coming years. These growth patterns are even more pronounced in the Southeast Asia and East Asia sub-regions, where, in the former, the urban population will be growing at an impressive rate of 3.26 per cent in average between 2005 and 2010, while in the latter the rural population has experienced a decline since 1995 that will reach a rate of 1.1 –point per cent increase in 2020, similar to the average annual rate of change of the rural population in Western Europe (refer to Figures 12 and 13).

**FIGURES 12 AND 13**  
**SOUTH-EASTERN AND EASTERN ASIA'S POPULATION GROWTH 1950 -2030**



Source: World Urbanization Prospects 2001



# LATIN AMERICA

MAP 4: PREVALENCE OF SLUMS IN LAC PER COUNTRY




TABLE 11  
SLUM INCIDENCE IN LAC REGION

	Total Population (Thousands)	Urban Population (Thousands)	Urban population as (%) of the total population	Slum population as (%) of the urban population	Slum Population (Thousands)
Latin America & the Caribbean	526,657	399,385	75.8	31.9	127,567
Central America	37,112	19,275	51.93	42.42	8,177
Caribbean	41,675	27,461	65.89	21.46	5,894.90
South America	347,485	277,795	79.94	35.56	98,803

Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) is the most urbanized region in the developing world: seventy-five per cent or 391 million of its people live in cities and towns. In seven countries the proportion of the urban population is more than 90 per cent of the country's population. According to the slum dweller indicators, in 2001 one-third of the total urban population (31.9) was living in these precarious settlements also known in the region, among other names, as *tugurios*, *asentamientos irregulares* or *favelas*.<sup>97</sup> This slum incidence is relatively low if compared with the other developing regions, but still high in absolute terms considering that it represents around 128 million people.

According to the World Bank, in the LAC region nearly 7 of every 10 poor people live in urban areas, and 39 per cent of the urban households live beneath the poverty line. Thus, there are more than twice as many urban poor than rural poor in the region: sixty-eight million rural poor compared with 138 million urban poor, a figure that is surprisingly close to the number of slum dwellers.<sup>98</sup>

LAC is anything but uniform in terms of human development indicators. Slum prevalence in the region is especially characterized by the heterogeneous conditions of sub-regions and countries. Central America, is the least urbanized area with slightly more than half of its population living in cities and towns (51.9 per cent), but with the highest urbanization growth, which was reported to be around 40 per cent in 1999,<sup>99</sup> while the slum prevalence reached 42.4 per cent in 2001. Whereas in the Caribbean sub-region slums represented 21.4 per cent of the total urban population in the same year, with a status of housing and access to basic services that has generally been relatively good. In South America, where urbanization has reached a very high but stable point of around 80 per cent, the proportion of slum dwellers reached 35.5 per cent in 2001 (refer to Table 11).

The region's income distribution is the most unequal in the entire world. In the 90s the Median GINI<sup>100</sup> coefficient for all LAC was 49.3 compared to those of Sub-Saharan Africa, 46.9 and East Asia and Pacific, 38.1. There is evidence that since 1980 the distribution of income has worsened in the region and inequality has risen sharply in the biggest economies: Argentina, Brazil and Mexico.<sup>101</sup>

Overall the slum incidence is higher in countries with the greatest degree and persistence of inequality –where the GINI coefficient is closer to 0.60–, such as Bolivia, Guatemala, and Peru, where six out of ten urban inhabitants are living in slums. However empirical evidence shows that the link between inequality and persistence of slums is not highly correlated in other countries. Argentina, for instance, has low level of inequality and rather high magnitude of slums (33.1), whereas in Mexico and Chile the magnitude of slum population is relatively low (19.6 and 8.6, respectively) but with a high level of inequality.

At the country level, disparities in the slum incidence are quite remarkable. Costa Rica and Honduras in **Central America** had a slum population that accounted for less than 20 per cent of the total urban population in 2001 (12.8 and 18.1 per cent, respectively). While urban settlers living in *barrios marginales* represented more than 62 per cent in Belize and Guatemala and 81 per cent in Nicaragua, the second poorest country in the continent.<sup>102</sup> In the latter two nations poverty is basically a rural and indigenous matter,<sup>103</sup> nonetheless, it is also rampant in urban areas, affecting around 60 per cent of households.<sup>104</sup>

This national perspective of slums reveals some surprising profiles where, despite its mid-range ranking in per capita GDP (3,660 US\$ in PPP terms), the proportion of slums in Guatemala is dramatically high.<sup>105</sup> The same is observed for malnutrition rates, which are abysmally elevated in the country, as well as other social indicators such as life expectancy, infant and maternal mortality and other health outcomes that rank among the poorest in the region. This poor performance can be attributed to the fact that the country is still emerging from several years of conflict and recurrent natural disasters, thus poverty is rampant both in the rural and urban settings.

Despite the fact that the **Caribbean** sub-region compares favourably with other areas of the continent, it is also characterized by large differences from one area to the next. In more than 10 countries, slums practically do not exist at least from the statistical point of view (less than 2 per cent). In Anguilla, Dominican Republic and Jamaica, the proportion of precarious settlements represented 35 to 40 per cent of the total urban population in 2001. Whereas in Haiti, the poorest country in LAC and among the poorest in the developing world<sup>106</sup>, the slum incidence is dramatically high, reaching 85.7 per cent of the total urban population. In line with the magnitude of slums other social indicators are also shocking in this country: life expectancy is only 57 years compared to the Latin American average of 69, less than half of the Haitian population is literate and only about one child in five of secondary-school age actually attends secondary school. Moreover, Haiti's infant mortality – one of the most significant indicators of poverty – is extremely high (92) and infant mortality – a consequence of poverty – reached 60 in the 90s, one of the highest of the continent. These economic and social indicators compare unfavourably with those of many Sub-Saharan African countries and are far lower than the average for Latin America and the Caribbean. With a total urban population estimated at more than 2.2 million people, Port-au-Prince concentrates a large number of *bidonvilles*.<sup>107</sup> However, there is evidence that secondary towns: Cap Haitien, Gonaive, and Les Cayes, suffer from shortages of housing and basic urban services as well.<sup>108</sup> While squatting is highly prevalent both in Port-au-Prince and secondary cities and towns.

*According to the slum dweller indicators, in 2001 one-third of the total urban population in LAC was living in these precarious settlements*

Around one-third of the urban population in the **Caribbean** sub-region is living in the capital city or in the main metropolitan area. In some of the Islands the level of urban primacy is dramatically high: In Nassau (Bahamas) it reaches around 68 per cent, In Bridgetown (Barbados) 50 per cent, while in Castries (Santa Lucia) and Basseterre (Saint Kitts) more than 45 per cent.<sup>109</sup> Housing such a level of their urban population, one would assume that the slum incidence would be higher in these countries, however with exception of Saint Lucia, where slums represented 11.9 per cent in 2001, the proportion of precarious settlements is extremely low (less than 5 per cent). Like many of the small islands of the world, countries in this sub-region are also facing severe water resource management problems.

With slightly more than one-third of the urban population considered slum dwellers, the picture in South America reveals a similar dimension like the one of the whole continent. However, deep inequalities persist in the sub-region: two countries had an urban slum population above 60 per cent in 2001 (Bolivia and Peru); three others sheltered between 30 to 40 per cent of informal settlers (Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela); three more had a slum population that accounted for one-fourth of the total urban population (Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay); and in five countries, which complete all the South American nations, slums represented less than ten per cent of urban dwellers (Chile, Falkland Islands, Guyana, Surinam and Uruguay).

Slums remain a major challenge in Bolivia, Peru and Venezuela. In the former two countries about two-thirds of their population is poor, basically in the rural areas. However, a household survey on family income conducted in 1997 in urban areas in Bolivia showed that approximately 51 per cent of the urban population were poor and 21 per cent lived in conditions of extreme poverty. Bolivia is landlocked, and its poorly developed communications infrastructure

limits its access to export markets, and exacerbates poverty.<sup>110</sup> Venezuela a resource-rich country, with some of the largest petroleum and mineral deposits in the Western Hemisphere, is a notable case. Slum prevalence is surprisingly high (40.7 per cent) and it is a consequence of uneven social development.<sup>111</sup> Far from improving, the poverty situation has been deteriorating over the past years, concomitant with a social and political turmoil in the country.

The slum situation described above may well be even greater in this region, taking into account that the *secure tenure dimension was not included in these estimates*. Indeed, in terms of land and housing tenure, a large proportion of the poor who claimed to be property owners have weak or no documentation on their properties in many of the Latin American cities, specially in central America. Thus, they should be considered as informal in that sense. Moreover, considering that, in absolute terms, the number of poor in LAC grew by some 3 million persons between 1999 to 2001, and about 7 million in 2000-2001, whom 5 million are indigent, it is quite likely that the deterioration of the living conditions amongst the most vulnerable groups might have contributed to increase the number of the slum population.<sup>112</sup> This situation is reflected by the fact that per capita GDP in the Latin American economies in 2002 was below the level recorded in 1997, which means that the last five years have been lost in terms of economic growth and social development.<sup>113</sup>


## OCEANIA

Oceania is the least populated of the MDG Regions. In overall terms, this is a wealthy continent. The two developed countries of the sub-region, Australia and New Zealand, had a slum incidence of nearly zero in 2001 (1.6 and 1 per cent, respectively). While in the rest of the Pacific Islands, which are the developing countries, the slum population accounted for almost one-fourth of the urban population. These nations have a rather low level of urbanization, with only 25 per cent of their total population living in cities and towns, while in the rest of the continent, the urban population reaches 70 per cent. However, averaging informal population in this manner, overestimates the number of slums in most of these countries, because of the high concentration of slum dwellers in only four Islands: Fiji in Melanesia, where nearly seven out of ten urban inhabitants were living in precarious settlements in 2001 (67.8 per cent); Kiribati in Micronesia with half of the population considered as being informal settlers (55.7 per cent); and the Melanesia islands of Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea each with a slum population of 37 and 19 per cent, respectively in the same year (refer to Table 12). However, the chronic lack of reliable data and up-to-date information on the Pacific Islands makes it difficult to ascertain the validity of this conclusion. Poor information has been a major problem in these remote areas, creating serious difficulties for policy makers and government planners.

TABLE 12  
HIGHEST INCIDENCE OF SLUMS IN OCEANIA

	Total Population (Thousands)	Urban Population (Thousands)	Urban population as (%) of the total population	Slum population as (%) of urban population	Slum Population (Thousands)
Fiji	823	413	50.2	67.8	279.8
Kiribati	84	32	38.6	55.7	17.8
Papua New Guinea	4,920	868	17.6	19.0	165.3
Vanuatu	202	45	22.1	37.0	16.7

FIGURE 14  
POPULATION GROWTH FOR KIRIBATI AND FIJI (1950-2030)



Taking into account the pattern of population growth in the poorest Pacific Islands, it is expected that slum will increase in coming years, particularly in Kiribati and Fiji. According to Figure 14, the rural population in both countries has been declining since 1995 and will continue the downward trend falling below the steadily increasing urban population by the period 2000-2005. This accelerated process of urbanization will exacerbate the incapacity of local authorities to provide basic services to meet the growing needs of an expanding population, especially considering that both countries are facing serious problems of weak local revenue generation and increased budget deficits, compounded with the difficulties generated by natural disasters, civil unrest and political disturbance.<sup>114</sup>

*Oceania is the least populated of the MDG Regions. In overall terms, this is a wealthy continent.*

## NOTES

- 44 Where  $y$  is the percentage of slum dwellers and  $x$  is the HDI value. The HDI value varies from 0 to 1, but for convenience they are multiplied by 100 and the computations are presented accordingly.
- 45 According to the World Bank, the global number of people living on less than one dollar per day fell slightly from about 1.28 billion in 1990 to 1.15 billion in 1999. World Bank, "Critics see Troubling Poverty Trends", press release, April 2002.
- 46 Neither do they analyse intra-city differentials. Refer to Chapter 6 of this study.
- 47 World Bank, *Ibid*.
- 48 Amis Philip, School of Public Policy, IDD, University of Birmingham, UK, January 2002.
- 49 According to the slum indicator, 94 per cent of the Chinese population has access to improved water.
- 50 UN-HABITAT, Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities, "Local Action for Global Goals", March 2003, p. 9.
- 51 *Ibid*, p. 18.
- 52 For instance, one-third of the urban water supplies in Africa and in Latin America and the Caribbean and more than half of those in Asia operate intermittently, and many do not disinfect their water. UN-HABITAT, Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities, *Ibid*.
- 53 UN-HABITAT, Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities, "Local Action for Global Goals", March 2003.
- 54 UNICEF/WHO, Millennium Development Goal, "Story Line", Water Supply, Target 10, New York, March 2003.
- 55 Over the 1990-2000 period, about 600 million people in urban areas globally gained access to improved sanitation, though the number of slum dwellers reached is not known. MDG "Story Line", Sanitation, Target 11, UNICEF/WHO, March 2003.
- 56 100% coverage of water supply in developed world. Source: "Global water supply and sanitation assessment report 2000" UNICEF/WHO, 2001.
- 57 Provision for sanitation is so poor in many African cities that significant proportions of their populations resort to open defecation in waste material (plastic bags) – this is termed "flying toilets" in Nairobi. UN-HABITAT, Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities, p. 30.
- 58 UN-HABITAT, Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities, "Local Action for Global Goals", March 2003, p. 21.
- 59 The smaller the city, the larger the proportion of the population with inadequate provision. Refer to the study, "Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities, Local Action for Global Goals", UN-HABITAT, March 2003, pp.16 and 30.
- 60 Refer to the recent work of Richard Stren et al "Cities Transformed: the Dynamics of Urban Demographic Change", US National Academy of Sciences, Population Council and SUNY Stony Brook, 2003.
- 61 UN-HABITAT, preliminary slum estimation, Nairobi 2003.
- 62 Urban poverty is far more sensitive to macroeconomic conditions than is rural poverty. For instance, in the 1980s recession, in response to the 10% contraction in per capita income in Latin America, the World Bank estimates that overall poverty rose by 17%, but urban poverty went up by 73%. ECLAC, "The impact of macroeconomic Environment on Urban Poverty", Chile, 1999. This is partially due to the fact that residential construction as a part of the GDP is low in developing countries because housing markets and land use planning are not well developed. In the USA, it accounts for 11% of the GDP.
- 63 GDP per capita grew to US\$230 in 2000, significantly improving incomes compared to five years earlier. Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty (2001-2005) PARPA, Government of Mozambique, 2000.
- 64 *Ibid*.
- 65 The mapping of poverty at city and intra-city levels, including slum and non-slum strata, is therefore necessary to identify pockets of poverty in order to direct priority actions to these areas (refer to point 6.2).
- 66 UN-HABITAT, Global Report on Human Settlements, "Facing the Slum Challenge", advanced draft, Nairobi, 2003.
- 67 Annex 2 presents some of the names as these settlements are known in the world.
- 68 This classification establishes, for instance, a distinction between Eastern and Western Europe, as used conventionally to distinguish the old CMEA (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) countries from the market economies, considering that it has begun to lose its rationale, as market-oriented development has proceeded apace in most transition countries. It seems therefore more sensible, to use an all-Europe grouping. This classification includes as well the now-official UN classifications for the least-developed, land-locked, and small island states, which can also be given as "side" classifications where appropriate.

## NOTES (CONT.)

- 69 High under-five mortality rates, child malnutrition, illiteracy indicators are higher than any other developing region of the world.
- 70 ECA, NEPAD, Conference of Ministries, Ethiopia, 1 June 2003.
- 71 World Bank/IMF, "Global Poverty Report", G8, Okinawa Summit, July 2000.
- 72 Economic growth rates across the continent slipped from 4.3 per cent to 3.2 per cent in 2002, marginally above population growth rates (3.7 per cent) and nowhere near the seven per cent required to meet the anti-poverty goals.
- 73 ECA, NEPAD, Conference of Ministries, Addis Ababa, June 2003.
- 74 The urban population will pass from 197 million inhabitants in 1990 to 589 million in 2020. World Urbanization Prospects.
- 75 Ministry of Federal Affairs, "Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Programme in Ethiopia", Addis Ababa, 2002.
- 76 Interim-PRSP, Chad, July 2000.
- 77 According to the Ethiopian PRSP and the I-PRSP in Chad, the percentage of the population with adequate toilet facilities or improved latrines is only 7 per cent.
- 78 UNDP, Evaluation of the role of UNDP in the PRSP process, New York, 2003.
- 79 The United Nations has classified 49 countries around the world as Least Developed Countries (LDCs), based on their low GDP per capita, weak human resources base and low level of economic diversification. Of that number, 34 or 67% are in sub-Saharan Africa.
- 80 Slums are a physical and spatial manifestation of increasing urban poverty and intra-city inequity. However, it is worth mentioning that slums do not accommodate all the urban poor, nor all slum dwellers are poor.
- 81 These countries are Angola, Burundi, C. Africa R., DRC, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Liberia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda, where more than half of the total population of the African LDCs is currently living.
- 82 The Displaced Children and Orphans Fund Abandonment and Separation of Children in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, note also the observation that "While families may perceive that their situation in the cities will improve, in fact, most are unprepared for life in the city. Among the many challenges they face is learning to survive without the support of the extended family unit, which traditionally helps families and communities meet their social and economic needs. In urban settings, families are more isolated, geographically, socially and psychologically, than their rural counterparts". USAID, Lynne Cripe et al. April 2002, p. 17.
- 83 UNDP, Angola: UN Common Country Assessment and Strategy (UNCCAS), Indicators and data, Luanda, 2002.
- 84 This concentration of the population in urban centres was provoked by the high number of Internally Displaced Population (IDPs). OCHA estimates that since 1992 up to December 2001 this number reached 4.1 million, that is, about one-third of the total population.
- 85 UNDP – HABITAT, "Poverty Profile of Liberia", p. 27, January 2001. This concentration of population was during the peak years of the war, when Internally Displaced People (IDPs) swarmed into Monrovia.
- 86 Ibid.
- 87 UNDP, Liberia, United Nations Common Country Assessment, 1998.
- 88 For instance, the City of Mbuji-Mayi in the DRC has grown from 400,000 in the past decade to 2 million, the major growth occurring in the past five years. USAID (2002). Currently, the city has a total population of 2.6 Million inhabitants.
- 89 The on-going conflict in Nepal has led to higher spending on security while reducing sharply budget expenditures in social issues. This situation has been aggravated by constant setbacks in garment exports and tourism receipts, which have contributed to a drastic fall in GDP, limiting further investments in social policies. Refer to the Economic and Social Survey produced by ESCAP, United Nations, p. 133, 2003.
- 90 A figure that is quite similar to the data provided by ESCAP at national level, which indicates that 23 per cent of the total population had access to safe water and 12 per cent to adequate sanitation in 2002 (and only 6 per cent to electricity).
- 91 Over the last decade, the population of Tajikistan increased by 14 per cent to 6.2 million in 2002, while GDP fell by 64 per cent, resulting in higher unemployment and poverty. While in Kyrgyzstan a poverty survey indicated that around 82 per cent of the family units lived below the poverty line. ESCAP, United Nations, op cit, p. 79, 2003.
- 92 Living conditions in Mongolia may continue to deteriorate, particularly for the urban poor, considering the high cost of housing and of staple food, and the difficulties that the education and health system are facing. Refer to the World Bank Country Report, Washington, Web page, 2001.

## NOTES (CONT.)

- 93 With a GNI per capita that oscillates from 890 (China) to 25,330 US Dollars (Hong Kong), and a slum incidence of 37 per cent for China and the Republic of Korea and only 2 per cent for Macao.
- 94 According to estimates from the World Bank, Vietnam is however making some progress in poverty reduction, reducing the percentage of the population living on less than one-dollar per day from 15.2 per cent in 2002 to 10.4 per cent in 2002. Nonetheless, the bank considers that inequality is increasing, since the incomes of people in the top 10 per cent of the income scale were 10.6 times the income of those in the bottom 10 per cent in 1996. This figure rose to 12 times in 1999 and further to 12.35 in 2002. Vietnam, World Bank Report 2002.
- 95 Asian Development Bank, Country Review, Sept.-Oct. 2002, Web page, pp. 4-11.
- 96 These are Arab countries: Lebanon (50), Iraq (56.7), Oman (60.5) and Yemen (65.1) and the Palestine territory (60).
- 97 Refer to Annex 2 "Slum Description and Definitions in LAC Selected Countries".
- 98 World Bank, Urban Upgrading in LAC, Washington, Web page, June 2002.
- 99 World Bank, "Urban Service Delivery and the Poor, the case of three Central American Cities", Report, June 2002.
- 100 GINI Index expresses income inequality. This index arranges units (persons, families, or households) in rank order, from poorest to richest; divides the hierarchy into fifths (quintiles) or tenths (deciles), and computes either the average income by decile or quintile or the share that each group has of the society's total income. Then, the shares or averages of rich and poor can be compared. The GINI is presented as a coefficient or ratio or number. In an egalitarian society, the GINI would be 0.000 (zero); the higher the GINI, then, the greater the disparity, and the more unequal the distribution of income. In a perfectly unequal society, in which one person (or household or family) had all the income, the GINI index would be 1.000. In practice, the GINI usually falls between 0.200 and 0.450.
- 101 ECLAC, "Preliminary Overview of the Economies of Latin America and the Caribbean", Chile, 2002, p. 7.
- 102 Nicaragua still remains among the poorest countries in the Western Hemisphere, with a 1998 per capita GNP of US\$410, which is only one-third of the regional average. Of the 33 LAC countries, Nicaragua is the poorest after Haiti. Approximately 50 percent of the population live in poverty and 19 percent live in extreme poverty. "Strengthened Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategies", Government of Nicaragua, 2001.
- 103 In Guatemala, 76 per cent of the indigenous are poor and over 81 per cent of them live in the countryside. World Bank, Poverty in Guatemala, February 2003. Whereas in Nicaragua poverty and extreme poverty remains overwhelmingly rural. It is estimated that two out of every three people in rural areas were poor, compared to one of three in urban areas in 1999. However, rural poverty index is reducing from 76.1 in 1993 to 68.5 in 1998. "Strengthened Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategies", *ibid*.
- 104 The hurricanes of the 90s, in addition to taking lives, have left many people homeless with no access to safe water supply systems.
- 105 World Bank, "Poverty in Guatemala", February 2003.
- 106 Per capita income in Haiti is US\$ 250, considerably less than one-tenth the region average.
- 107 The flow from rural areas to urban bidonvilles, particularly in Port-au-Prince, has been steady, with 13,000 people arriving every year from all regions of the country. Port-au-Prince grew from half a million inhabitants in 1971 to 720,000 in 1982 and more than two million in 1999. Haitian Institute of Statistics.
- 108 Slum prevalence in these human settlements would be even higher considering that housing conditions are dilapidated, unsafe, unsanitary, and overcrowded. Most families live in one room, often with six or more individuals and few possessions.
- 109 United Nations, World Urbanization Prospects, 2001.
- 110 Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy, Bolivia, January 2000.
- 111 In addition to increased poverty, inequality has also increased –the Gini coefficient increased from about 0.47 in the mid 90s to about 0.50 in the late 1990s. Venezuela's income distribution is highly skewed, for instance, in 2000, the top 20 per cent of all households received about 55 per cent of total income while the bottom 20 per cent obtained 3 per cent. World Bank, Interim Country Assistance Strategy for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, November 2002, p. 11.
- 112 ECLAC, *Ibid*, p.37. The sharpest deterioration in poverty took place in ARGENTINA whose 5.6 –point increase in poverty and 3.1 –point increase in extreme poverty in the last two years are clearly anomalous in the region. ECLAC, Social Panorama of Latin America, p. 14, 2002.
- 113 ECLAC, Preliminary Overview of the Economies of Latin America and the Caribbean, 2002, p. 7.
- 114 For instance, according to available data in kiribati Island in Micronesia, the GDP growth in the last years was in the order of 0.2 to 0.4 per cent, while the population growth was around 2 per cent. Economic and Social Survey produced by ESCAP, United Nations, p. 103, 2003.

## 6 FURTHER DISCUSSION

### 6.1 An Information Crisis



There is growing evidence that the locus of poverty is gradually shifting from rural to urban areas as confirmed in various poverty studies, surveys on living conditions, and other relevant national and local urban indicators. However, it is clear that many of the phenomena and processes that characterize urbanization continue to be poorly documented, and that the depiction of the city, its problems and its potential still remain sorely distorted.

A serious problem for urban policy in both developed and developing countries has been a lack of appropriate data at the city level. National and international data collecting and analysis systems, as well as the reporting mechanisms limit their scope at the country level. Even though local level data are available in most instances, National Statistical Offices, or other agencies do not consider analyzing them at the city level, as part of their mainstream mandate.

Most cities in the developing world are suffering from an information crisis, which is seriously undermining their capacity to develop and analyse effective urban policy. They do not have sustained or systematic appraisal of urban problems and little appreciation of what their own remedial policies and programs are in fact achieving. Existing indicators and tools for urban policy have been largely inadequate in providing an overall picture of the city and how it works. Rarely do they provide the means for understanding the relationship between policy and urban outcomes, nor do they provide an indication of the relationship between the performance of individual sectors and broader social and economic development results. Most of the major economic aggregates, which might measure the health of the urban economy, such as city product, investment or trade, are not available. Other data which might measure the condition of the population, infrastructure and the environment, are available in


some places but not others and are seldom collected in a consistent international framework. Data measuring the internal spatial structure of the city, its economy and the distribution of opportunities is not collected in many parts of the world.

Decision-makers are aware of the necessity for data in policy making, to provide objective measures of conditions and trends, to avoid or to correct mistakes, and to rethink ineffective policy. The problem is that, while enormous amounts of data are being generated at high costs throughout the world, they are very poorly understood and are often inappropriate, inaccurate, incomplete or not generated for specific policy purposes. There is a global need to build national and local capacity to collect useful information on urban conditions and trends, to convert that information to knowledge through appropriate analytical techniques and to apply that knowledge in formulating and modifying urban policies and programmes. This need is made more urgent by national commitments to monitor progress in attaining the numerous objectives of the *Habitat Agenda* and the Millennium Development Goals.<sup>115</sup>

### 6.2 The Need for Sub-city Level Information

Urban areas often look good on paper. Statistics suggest that those living in large cities are better off and have more services than any one else in the rest of the country. These numbers, however, conceal the large disparities found in most urban areas because the poor and their unmet needs are lost per capita averages.<sup>116</sup>

MAP 5: URBAN POVERTY MAP: PERCENTAGE OF INFORMAL DWELLINGS AND LOCATION OF DWELLING WITH POOR SANITATION CONDITIONS WITHIN CENSUS EAS.



The need for comprehensive, comparable and reliable information on cities and towns has long been recognized. However, along with the collection and analysis of data at city level, the need for disaggregated information at intra-city level is also recognized. Indeed, city-aggregated information is often misleading. All urban households –rich and poor– are averaged out to provide a single estimate of poverty, overlooking existing pockets of poverty in the city, and consequently underestimating the urban poor and the conditions in which they live. Studies in this area showed, for instance, that children living in urban areas might be up to ten times more at risk of being stunted if they are from poor households compared to children from households of higher socio-economic status. The fact that there are consistently such strong socio-economic gradients in urban areas of developing countries *implies that reliance on global average statistics to allocate resources between rural and urban areas could be dangerously misleading*.<sup>117</sup>

Moreover, recent evidence on the incidence of chronic poverty in some countries suggests that both rural and urban populations are facing conditions of chronic or intense poverty. In India, for instance, it was found that the proportion of the population who were in the very poor category was 15 per cent for India's urban population, which was the same proportion as that of India's rural population.<sup>118</sup> In many other countries, with the exception of China, the proportion of households below the poverty line is often slightly lower than for rural areas.

There is an increased evidence of what is known as an “urban penalty”, in which a number of key health indicators for vulnerable populations is as bad or close to what is for the equivalent poor rural populations.<sup>119</sup> Despite the improved coverage of health services and basic service delivery in some countries, certain population groups have been left behind and opportunities remain unevenly distributed. This is particularly true in several slum settlement areas in the world, which are actually more disadvantaged than the rural population, especially in the LDCs with a high rate of urbanization. Infant mortality rates are twice as high there than the national rural average and slum children under five suffer more and die more often from diarrhea and acute respiratory infection than rural children. They are also more under-nourished children elsewhere in the world.<sup>120</sup> The most urgent need for better data is obviously at the level where the deficiencies are to be tackled –that is, data for each household in each urban area, and for districts and municipalities within urban areas. It is clear that analysis of data at the intra-city level is fundamental to inform local policy development (see maps 6 and 7). The earlier practice of simply providing urban versus rural estimates has masked the crisis that slum dwellers are facing. To improve the lives of slum dwellers, local policy needs to be informed about the consequences of vastly different living conditions experienced by slum and non-slum dwellers (refer to Box 6). For that purpose there is a need to assemble and disaggregate existing indicators to describe sub-city areas and design a database capable of maintaining and updating this information. Otherwise, the urban bias argument will be perpetuated by lack of meaningful urban data.<sup>121</sup>



## Box 7: Data collection on slums

Data collection and analysis on urban slums encounters a critical problem. Information is rarely disaggregated according to intra-urban location or socioeconomic criteria. Data sets such as Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) disaggregate by “urban” and “rural,” but go no further. Thus, slum populations and the poorest squatters are statistically identical to middle class and wealthy urban dwellers. Worse, the poorest urban populations are often not included at all in data gathering. Without exception, these efforts at disaggregating household survey data by wealth and location show disparities—often large ones—between the poorer socioeconomic quintiles and the upper, wealthier ones. In urban areas, a graded effect of economic conditions on mortality, morbidity, and malnutrition is apparent through the quintile analysis. However, urban slum health data are inadequate. There is a real need for surveys to include specific data collection strategies for defined urban slum or squatter settlement populations in addition to other urban segments. Nonetheless, several efforts have been made over the past 20 years to re-analyze large data sets where the geographic origins of the data can clearly be identified as “slum” and “non-slum” strata.

## Box 8: Maps of poverty and GIS – understanding intra-city differentials

The source of the data in Map 5 and Map 6 is the South Africa Population Census of 1996, available at the Enumeration Area (EA) level. The availability of both data at such fine resolution and Geographic Information System (GIS) allows mapping and analysis of data at the sub-city level that is fundamental for understanding and assessing the urban poor conditions and informing local policy development. GIS is a powerful tool that provides the capabilities to visually display data and perform spatial statistical analysis at different levels. When disaggregated slums indicators are available, GIS becomes an essential resource to address the questions related to slums conditions in a way that takes into account intra-city level variations. Map 5 and Map 6 illustrates examples of how data on slums indicators, such as access to improved drinking water, and inadequate sanitation, could be combined with socio-economic, demographic or health indicators, if available, to better understand the dynamics and problems of slums within cities.


“Informal Dwellings” in Map 5 indicates enumeration areas where more than 50% of the dwellings are classified as “informal”. Informal dwellings include: informal dwellings in backyard, informal dwellings elsewhere, and caravan/tent. Other types of dwelling are: traditional dwelling, flat in block of flats, town/cluster/semi-detached house, unit in retirement village, and house/flat/room in backyard. The “Percent of informal dwellings” in Map 6 indicates the percentage of the total number of dwellings (sum of all the above types) that are informal within each enumeration area.

“Inadequate Sanitation” indicates enumeration areas where more than 50% of the households have excreta disposal system consisting of pit latrine, bucket latrine or none (as opposed to flush or chemical toilet).

“Median Income” indicates the 50th percentile income within each enumeration area.

Source: Center for International Earth Science Information Network, Columbia University, 2003

MAP 6: URBAN POVERTY MAP: CLASSES OF INCOME AND LOCATION OF INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS WITHIN CENSUS ENUMERATION AREAS IN CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA.



## 6.3 Refine the Precision of the Estimation

Refining the estimates is a work in progress for UN-HABITAT. It is recognized that the indicators used to identify a slum dweller do not enumerate the quality of service delivery, nor do they include other socio-economic dimensions. Indeed, defining slum dwellers on the basis of infrastructure alone is obviously insufficient. It is now recognized that social capital can be equal to, or more important, than physical capital or human capital in development.<sup>122</sup> In line with the development of measurement tools for social capital, UN-HABITAT intends to monitor social capital differentials and to include these measurements as indicators of the slum condition in some selected cities in the world, as part of the UN-HABITAT “Monitoring Urban Inequities Programme”.

The following remarks about the slum indicators summarize some of the points under review:

### *Water and sanitation*

As the UN-HABITAT Water and Sanitation Report (2003) states “Governments and international agencies need to recognize that urban areas have particular needs for water and sanitation that are distinct from rural areas, and they also have particular advantages over rural settlements. It is still common for the same definition of what constitutes ‘improved’ or ‘adequate’ access to water to be applied to all urban and rural settlements. For instance, some governments classify everyone who has a water source within 200 meters of their home as having provision for water, but having a tap within 200 meters of your home in a rural settlement with 200 persons per tap is not the same as having a public tap within 200 meters in an urban squatter settlement with 5000 persons per tap”.<sup>123</sup> “Improved” provision for water is often no more than a public tap shared by several hundred people with an intermittent supply of water. Whereas “improved” sanitation is often no more than a latrine, to which access is difficult, shared among many households.

Access to improved water and sanitation is estimated using the “technology” adopted by households to get water. Definitions of “improved” technologies are thus based on assumptions that certain technologies are better for health than others. These assumptions may not be true in all individual cases. For instance, in some locations an unprotected household well may provide a better supply of water, both in terms of quantity and quality of water, than a household connection, which may be subject to intermittent, and poor water quality.<sup>124</sup>

Moreover, access to a flush toilet that is not operational cannot be counted as acceptable, but with existing questionnaires we are not able to distinguish between a functioning flush toilet and one that is permanently out of order. Also, while household surveys provide the most accurate available data, they suffer from other problems. Definitions of services vary not only between the different types of surveys undertaken, but also over time. It is therefore sometimes difficult to compare surveys undertaken even within the same country.

In addition, people often use more than one water source, and it is difficult to ascertain the quality, accessibility, regularity and cost of each, and whether its use is a problem.<sup>125</sup> The indicators used to measure the adequacy of access to water supply in the above estimates do not take into account the cost of water or the time required to fetch water. Similarly, for sanitation, the adequacy of the service does not take into account the cost of accessing a public latrine, or the waiting time or the issue of maintenance and cleanliness of the toilets.

As the UN-HABITAT Report on Water and Sanitation (2003) indicates, “good sanitation needs good quality provision in the home (e.g. the toilet), the immediate surroundings (e.g. connection to a sewer or to a pit or septic tank that

does not contaminate the groundwater or other’s people water) and the neighborhood (provision to ensure no human contact with excreta and to make sure that wastewater is removed safely).<sup>126</sup> Thus, global and regional assessments of water and sanitation provision for the world’s urban (and rural) populations (which have to draw primarily on existing censuses and households surveys) are not able to measure the proportion of people with access to safe water and good quality sanitation, and have a very limited ability to identify where those with inadequate provision are”.

UN-HABITAT and its partners are refining questions on access to improved water and improved sanitation that will begin to appear in various household surveys in the coming years. These are intended to enumerate the quality of water and sanitation services to supplement the questions regarding the type of technology used. Other aspects of water and sanitation include the gender issues of access, child access to facilities and the number of households using the same facility. Questions regarding these aspects of sanitation are under peer review.

Although generally regarded as an important aspect of sanitation, the removal or treatment of solid waste by a household has not been widely collected in surveys. In urban areas this is especially critical and for many observers the condition of solid waste disposal is the first impression of an unacceptable living condition.<sup>127</sup> It is the intention of UN-HABITAT and its partners to encourage the collection of data on household solid-waste-disposal methods through household surveys. These improvements will enhance and refine the definition of sanitation and the slum condition.

### *Durability of housing and overcrowding*

Questions on the durability of housing are to be improved. These improvements will include more information on the surroundings of the household and the community, such as the condition of dwellings adjacent to the interviewed unit, the condition of the dwelling and whether it is dilapidated beyond repair, is dilapidated but repairable, or is under construction are to be encouraged in urban household surveys.

Internal air pollution (IAP) is an important aspect of environmental health. IAP is closely related to acute respiratory disease. Households without adequate ventilation and without a separate room for cooking can be at risk. Single room dwellings without ventilation may be classified as a slum dwelling. Questions regarding the provision of ventilation for cooking and heating are to be encouraged in household questionnaires and may become a basis for classification as a slum dwelling.

### *Secure tenure*

Originally, the United Nations system assigned two indicators for Target 11: proportion of people with secure tenure (indicator 31) and proportion of people with access to improved sanitation (indicator 32). Subsequently, it was recognized that tenure and sanitation did not adequately constitute a complete response to this target.<sup>128</sup> UN-HABITAT organized a gathering of experts to modify these indicators and to refine the definitions of secure tenure and slums.<sup>129</sup> The experts’ opinion was that due to its political dimension and regional diversity, the definition should be as generic as possible. This would allow global acceptance and comparisons, using indicators that reflect local variations, specific trends and dynamics.<sup>130</sup>

Based on this generic definition, secure tenure should not be understood narrowly as a question of access to land and one roof. Rather, it should be seen as



a platform for development, with long-term implications in terms of security, housing investments<sup>131</sup>, possibility of planning and other social and economic effects. Moreover, this concept encompasses protection from unhealthy locations due to different forms of environmental hazards that increase vulnerability of inhabitants. These elements and strategic values are highlighted in the UN-HABITAT Global Campaign for Secure Tenure.<sup>132</sup> However, despite these fundamental considerations, the definition and related sub-indicators that are part of the slum indicators were selected in a method as simple and operational as possible, without including neither the long-term aspect of the concept, nor its more integral approach. Hence, the definition and the measurement focus on “*evictions*”, which is the extreme version of the general harassment of probably the majority of people who are currently involved in providing themselves with one of the most basic necessities of life.<sup>133</sup>

Along with this sub-indicator, which is “either de facto or perceived / protection from forced evictions”, it was decided to include a second sub-indicator: “the proportion of urban population who have documents as evidence of secure tenure”. The measurement of this sub-indicator does not take into account the tenure type of land/residence occupation, nor does it consider that the tenure status (owner, tenant or other) is a reliable indicator of secure tenure. This position is in line with the Habitat Global Campaign on Secure Tenure, which focuses primarily on the strength of the security, rather on the precise nature and form in which the tenure is applied.

The evidence of documentation could vary per countries and cities and include, among others, legal ownership that can be proven by an official title deed; a written agreement, which can be defended in court; other tenancy agreements such as temporary occupancy license, certificates, permits issued by non-official

authorities (traditional chiefs), and; any other document such as municipal taxes, water bills, etc. For these two sub-indicators a provision was made to measure women's equal right to secure tenure.

The lack of data on cities in developing countries and slum dwellers in particular, poses constraints on the type of analysis, which could be carried out about the secure tenure concept and indicators. Presently secure tenure information is basically gathered through the collection and analysis of broad indicators (i. e. shelter indicators), which provide complementary measures for a summary diagnostic of the sector, but not on the secure tenure concept itself. Unfortunately, measurement and analysis of tenure types and the respective degrees of security have not yet been incorporated in mainstream monitoring instruments.

This study, and particularly the slum estimation, did not use the secure tenure indicator because most countries in the world are lacking this information. Nevertheless, as it is argued in several parts of the document, informal settlements by their very nature do not possess formal secure tenure. Therefore, setting up conditions to monitor this indicator is work in progress for UN-HABITAT. Currently, the Agency is designing and testing household questions that shortly will enable the collection and analysis of data for this indicator. A set of questions is being prepared, responding adequately to the multi-dimension of the concept. These would include, possession of documents of entitlement, access to debt finance, perception of the risk of arbitrary eviction, rights' access and occupancy and knowledge of the actions of recourse that can be taken should an eviction occur. Also, being considered alongside this is the legal framework in place, which may either be inaccessible to or does not serve the urban poor. Security of tenure is a critical component of UN-HABITAT programmes and policies.

# NOTES

- 115 Global Urban Observatory, project document, Urban Indicators Programme, 1999.
- 116 Environmental Health Project, Activity Report 14, USAID, December 2002.
- 117 Basta (1977). Ruel et al (1998) proved that the “average” urban child is consistently less likely to suffer from stunted growth than the “average” rural child, yet in virtually every case studied in the present analysis, there was a distinct group of highly vulnerable urban children that should be high on the list of national priorities for nutrition-oriented interventions. Purnima Menon, Marie T. Ruel, and Saul S. Morris (1999), “Socio-economic Differentials In Child Stunting are consistently larger in urban than in rural areas”, Food Consumption and Nutrition Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C.
- 118 Amis Philip, School of Public Policy, IDD, University of Birmingham, UK, January 2002.
- 119 World Bank, Urban Poverty in Latin America, Concept Note, 2002.
- 120 UNCHS 2001, APHRC, 2002, UN-HABITAT 2003. Refer also to other studies such as Richard Stren et al “Cities Transformed: the Dynamics of Urban Demographic Change”, National Academies Press, USA, 2003. The work of Msiyaphazi Eliya et al, “Sexual risk-taking in the slums of Nairobi” 1993-1998; Brockerhoff “The Poverty of Cities in Developing Countries” In: “Population and Development Review” 1998.
- 121 There is also the long established tradition of judging urban areas as “parasitic” or seeing them as “places of privilege” to which fewer resources should be steered, including those needed to improve water and sanitation provision. This helps explain why water and sanitation provision in urban areas has received inadequate attention. UN-HABITAT, “Water and Sanitation in the World’s Cities, Local Action for Global Goals”, March 2003, p. XXII.
- 122 World Bank, Social Capital Thematic Group, 2003.
- 123 UN-HABITAT, “Water and Sanitation in the World’s Cities, Local Action for Global Goals”, March 2003.
- 124 UNICEF/WHO, “Global Water Supply and Sanitation Assessment Report 2000”.
- 125 UN-HABITAT, “Water and Sanitation in the World’s Cities, Local Action for Global Goals”, March 2003.
- 126 Ibid.
- 127 Most informal settlements in urban areas of Africa have no service to collect solid waste. In many African cities, only 10-30 per cent of all urban households’ solid wastes are collected, and services are inevitable deficient in the slums. Refer to the case studies of the UN-HABITAT Report “Water and Sanitation in the World’s Cities”.
- 128 The UN-Inter Agency Development Group, report of meeting, New York, 2002.
- 129 EGM organized by UN-HABITAT and partners (UNSD and Cities Alliance), Nairobi, October 2002.
- 130 Indeed, security of tenure is a very relative concept, therefore it is extremely difficult to provide a clear-cut response on whether a particular tenure status is safe or not. Moreover, security of tenure is influenced by the conditions and perceptions of tenure that vary according to actors (inhabitants, public institutions, decision-makers, etc.) and different contexts, and also over time. Expert Group Meeting, Final Report, Nairobi, January 2003.
- 131 It is widely accepted that lack of secure tenure limits access to debt finance collateralized by structure and the land.
- 132 UN-HABITAT, Concept paper of the Campaign on Secure Tenure, Nairobi, 2002.
- 133 The operational definition indicates “*Secure Tenure is the right of all individuals and groups to effective protection by the State against unlawful evictions*”.

“Good sanitation needs good quality provision in the home (e.g. the toilet), the immediate surroundings (e.g. connection to a sewer or to a pit or septic tank that does not contaminate the groundwater or other's people water) and the neighborhood (provision to ensure no human contact with excreta and to make sure that wastewater is removed safely).




Photo by Thierry Geenen for the Nairobi River Basin Project, UNEP

## 7 CONCLUSIONS

Today 3 billion people –nearly half of the World’s population– lives in cities. According to the slum indicators, one-third are slum dwellers. Moreover, four out of ten inhabitants in the developing world are informal settlers. They experience multiple deprivations that are direct expressions of poverty. Many of their houses are unfit for habitation and they often lack adequate food, education health and basic services that the better-off take for granted.<sup>134</sup> Frequently their locations (neighborhoods, residential areas, etc.) are not recognized by local and central authorities. However, in many parts of the world these “invisible” areas are growing faster than the “visible” ones. It is expected that 95 per cent of the population increase expected during 2000-2030 will be absorbed by the urban areas of the less developed regions whose population will likely rise from approximately 2 billion in 2000 to just under 3.5 billion in 2030. In a rather moderate projection, it is estimated that by the year 2020, the current 30 per cent level of urban poverty in the world could reach 45 to 50 per cent of the total population living in cities. Within this scenario, urban slums will double, accounting for almost two billion people on the planet.

Prevailing evidence has portrayed that slums do not accommodate all the urban poor, nor are all slum dwellers always poor. However, in general terms, slums are the expression of poverty, group inequality and social exclusion. They are associated with various forms of discrimination, unequal access to essential social services and to participation in government. Slums are synonymous with intra-city inequality. This urbanization process amid poverty confronts us with a wide-ranging social transformation – *the emergence of slums as a distinctive category of human settlements*.

No previous attempt to ascertain and update slum statistics in the world at country level was undertaken before this study. The absence of data from large areas of the world on slum indicators substantiate the view that these precarious settlements are still “**zones of silence**” in terms of public knowledge, opinion and discussion about urban poverty. The principal findings of this study may therefore shed new light on current debates about the urbanization of poverty and the ways to overcome it.

The figures and analysis presented here may be controversial. However this is the first time over 1 million household records were reviewed to reach these estimates. They therefore provide a solid baseline information for future analysis on slum incidence and trends, which will be extremely useful for comparisons between countries, sub-regions and regions.

The magnitude of the challenge may be even greater than described. Considerable work remains to be done in the methodological area presented in this paper. In particular, the scope of work for this preliminary estimate calls for a review of the agreed methodology and also the existing data sources. Results, however, should be considered as a first effort to document the magnitude and dimension of slums in the world, providing disaggregated information beyond the conventional rural-urban category. Based on this study, other works will soon provide key statistical information on these precarious settlements, and it will be possible to develop time series on slums indicators, helping to track in a more systematic manner the ‘improvement’ in the lives of the slum dwellers.



MDG monitoring activities are the institutional framework for this study, particularly Target 11, which aims at “achieving by 2020 a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers”. In support of these goals *Governments need to reiterate their commitment to poverty reduction as an overarching development goal. Setting genuine targets is a prerequisite to direct policy and galvanized action.*

This database can help Governments set their own targets to address urban poverty in these precarious settlements, using their own existing information. This is particularly important considering the current inattention to urban poverty by both the national and local authorities, and the donor community<sup>135</sup>, which justifies this study as an advocacy tool that calls for more attention to urban poverty in general, and to poverty in slum areas in particular. The rigorous exercise of collecting and analyzing information at this level should therefore be considered as an effort to promote the systematic gathering of indicators at sub-national level, in order to understand urban inequalities better.

The preliminary estimates of slums presented in this paper provide a strong case for local and central authorities to put both economic and social policies and resources within a short and medium-term framework. It is true that developing countries are under severe constraints with regard to institutional capacity and financing resources. These often serve to limit the extent of reforms, policies and actions. However, a number of incremental measures, that take into consideration the constraints faced by these countries, can be taken over the medium term.

Slum improvement is not only a goal in itself for a better quality of life, but it also provides a positive impact on the health burden and the economic development of a country. Thus, it is clear that huge financial resources are needed in most developing countries to undertake this endeavor.<sup>136</sup> Shifting resources from under-productive sectors and from areas that are not directly pro-poor oriented can go some way towards meeting the target.<sup>137</sup> Channeling multiple sources of financing is required to raise sufficient resources, involving both public and private sectors, communities, NGOs, bilateral donors and multilateral organizations. However, it is important to note that it was beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the actions and measures required to improve slums and also to prevent their creation. Efforts and actions are underway, and further studies and analysis should be undertaken to evaluate their impact in more depth.<sup>138</sup>

Empirical evidence in this report concludes that the spatial landscape of poverty is increasingly urban in nature. Population growth will be only in cities and towns, and poverty will be growing at least as fast as these cities grow. Soon, the bulk of the most vulnerable population in the world will be found in these precarious settlement. Slums in the world are the face of urban poverty in the new Millennium.

## NOTES

- 134 Poverty is a concept in the making and the way this concept is used is not neutral. Yet it has many synonyms. Poverty means social exclusion (deprivation of opportunity to participate in society or a progressive deprivation of resources and of social links). It also means disadvantages in every form, human misery, dependency, social instability and economic morbidity. Poverty is both a question of means and resources, opportunities and constraints, and also of how the human end goals are achieved. The conceptual linkage between urban poverty and slums should be studied further.
- 135 Although most of the PRSPs already completed acknowledge the existence and importance of urban poverty in one way or another, very few of them, if any, address poverty in cities and towns in a separate chapter. This relative absence of attention is a serious concern because the policies of national and local development agencies and its international donors will almost certainly follow the PRSPs frameworks. Despite the very large differences between nations (and cities) in low- and middle-income nations, what virtually all have shared is an unwillingness or incapacity on the part of national and local governments to address this. This has not been helped by the reluctance of most international agencies to commit resources towards addressing this; in fact most have given very little support to 'significantly improving the lives of slum dwellers; and many others have given none.
- 136 Refer to the preliminary estimations on cost estimates for Target 11 on slums improvement, currently undertaken by UN-HABITAT, July 2003.
- 137 Even with a fixed amount of resources, better outcomes could be achieved through re-prioritising expenditures within sectors according to need and importance.
- 138 Refer to, among others, the following documents: David Satterthwaite, "Sustaining slum improvement and social development in urban areas", draft document, 2003; Work Plan of the Task Force 8 on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers, 2003; UN-HABITAT "Story line, improving conditions of slum dwellers", 2003 and specific actions taken.

## 8 REFERENCES

- African Development Bank, World Bank and International Monetary Fund, "Global Poverty Report - Achieving the Millennium Development Goals in Africa: Progress, Prospects and Policy Implications", Web page, July 2002.
- Africa Population Health Research Centre, "Monitoring the Millennium Development Goal, Target 11 - Slum Dweller Estimation at the Country Level", Nairobi, April 2002.
- Amis Philip, School of Public Policy, IDD, University of Birmingham, UK, January 2002.
- Asian Development Bank, Country Review, Sept.- Oct., Web page, 2002.
- Brockerhoff "The Poverty of Cities in Developing Countries" In: "Population and Development Review", 1998.
- CEPAL, "Panorama Social de América Latina 2001-2002", Chile, Octubre 2002.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, "World Housing Survey 1974: an overview of the state of housing, building and planning within human settlements", New York, 1976.
- Depaule, J-Ch., Topalov, C. (2000) *La ville à travers ses mots*, MOST Project, UNESCO, Paris, 2002.
- ECA, NEPAD, Conference of Ministries, Ethiopia, Web page, 01 June 2003.
- ECLAC, "The Impact of Macroeconomic Environment on Urban Poverty", Chile, 1999.
- ECLAC, "Preliminary Overview of the Economies of Latin America and the Caribbean", Chile, 2002.
- ESCAP, United Nations, Economic and Social Survey of Asia and the Pacific, New York, 2003.
- Environmental Health Project (EHP), Activity Report 14, USAID, December 2002.
- Government of Bolivia, Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy, La Paz, January 2000.
- Government of Chad, "Interim-Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)", July 2000.
- Government of Ethiopia, Ministry of Federal Affairs, "Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Programme in Ethiopia", Addis Ababa, 2002.
- Government of Mozambique, "Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty (2001-2005)", PARPA, 2000.
- Government of Nicaragua, "Strengthened Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategies", Managua, 2001.
- Haitian Institute of Statistics, various tables, Port-au-Prince, 2001.
- H.J. Dyos et D.A. Reeder "Slums and Suburbs", in: H.J. Dyos et Michael Wolff, (eds.), *The Victorian City: Images and Realities*, vol. 2, *Shapes on the Ground*.
- Johns Hopkins University, "Meeting the Urban Challenge", Extracted from *Population Reports*, Volume XXX, Number 4, Fall 2002.
- International Labour Organization (ILO), United Nations, "Unemployment threatens world cities", Web page, 1996.
- López Moreno Eduardo, "From Structural Adjustment Programmes to Poverty Reduction Strategies", UN-HABITAT, Nairobi, 2002.
- Mehta Dinesh, "The Urbanization of Poverty", In: *Habitat Debate*, Vol. 6, Num. 4, Nairobi, 2000.
- Millennium Project, Task Force on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers, Background Paper, New York, 2003.
- Msiyaphazi Eliya et al, "Sexual risk-taking in the slums of Nairobi" 1993-1998, APHRC, Nairobi, 2003.
- OCHA Angola, Country Report, Luanda, 2002.
- Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat, "World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision, Data Tables and Highlights", 20 March 2002.
- Purnima Menon, Marie T. Ruel, and Saul S. Morris, Food Consumption and Nutrition Division, International Food Policy Research Institute, Washington, D.C., 1999.

- Satterthwaite David, "Sustaining Slum Improvement and Social Development in Urban Areas", Weihai theme, unpublished document, London, 2003.
- Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Public Management, Home Affairs, Posts and Telecommunications, "Housing and Land Survey 1998", Japan.
- Stren Richard et al, "Cities Transformed: the Dynamics of Urban Demographic Change", US National Academy of Sciences, Population Council and SUNY Stony Brook, 2003.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UN-HABITAT, "Poverty Profile of Liberia", Monrovia, January 2001.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Human Development Report – Human Development Index, Web page, 2003.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Angola: "UN Common Country Assessment and Strategy (UNCCAS), Indicators and data", Luanda, 2002.
- UNICEF/WHO, Millennium Development Goal, "Story Line", Water Supply, Target 10, New York, March 2003.
- UNICEF/WHO, Millennium Development Goal, "Story Line", Sanitation, Target 11, New York, March 2003.
- UNICEF/WHO, "Global water supply and sanitation assessment report 2000", New York, 2001.
- UN-HABITAT, Global Report on Human Settlements, "Facing the Slum Challenge", advanced draft, Nairobi, 2003.
- UN-HABITAT, Guide to Monitor Target 11, "Improving the Lives of at Least 100 Million Slum Dwellers", Progress towards the Millennium Development Goals, Nairobi, May 2003.
- UN-HABITAT, Report of the Expert Group Meeting on Urban Indicators "Secure Tenure, Slums and Global Sample of Cities", 28-30 October 2002, Nairobi, unpublished document, January 2003.
- UN-HABITAT, Expert Group Meeting in urban indicators, "Background Paper", Nairobi, 2002.
- UN-HABITAT, The "Habitat Agenda", Istanbul, 1976.
- UN-HABITAT, Regional Office for Africa and the Arab States, "ECOSOC Report on Poverty in Africa", 2001.
- UN-HABITAT, "Guidelines for Operational Definitions for Household Surveys in Cities on Secure Tenure and Slums", unpublished document, Nairobi, 2002.
- UN-HABITAT, "Preliminary Study of UN-HABITAT costing the Millennium Target 11 on Slums", unpublished working document, Nairobi, May 2003.
- UN-HABITAT, "Crowding and Health in Low Income Settlements of Guinea Bissau", SIEP Occasional Series No. 1, 1998.
- UN-HABITAT, "Global Report on Human Settlements", "The Challenge of the Slums", Nairobi, 1996.
- UN-HABITAT, "Water and Sanitation in the World's Cities, Local Action for Global Goals", March 2003.
- UN-HABITAT, Concept paper of the Campaign on Secure Tenure, Nairobi, 2002.
- United Nations, Millennium Project, Background Paper of the Millennium Development Goals, Task Force 8 "Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers", New York, 2003.
- United Nations (2001), Statistical Commission, Report on the thirty-second session (6-9 March 2001), Economic and Social Council, Official Records, 2001, Supplement No. 4, New York, 2003.
- United Nations Statistics Division, Housing Statistics, 2000-2001.
- United Nations Statistical Division (UNSD) and the Population Division (PD), Millennium Development Goals, Regions, circular, New York, 2003.
- USAID, Lynne Cripe et al, "Displaced Children and Orphans Fund Abandonment and Separation of Children in the Democratic Republic of the Congo", Washington, April 2002.
- World Bank, "Interim Country Assistance Strategy for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela", Washington, November 2002.
- World Bank, Urban Upgrading in LAC, Washington, Web page, June 2002.
- World Bank, "Urban Service Delivery and the Poor, the case of three Central American Cities", Report, Washington, June 2002.
- World Bank, "Urban Poverty in Latin America", Concept Note, Washington, 2002.
- World Bank/IMF, "Global Poverty Report", G8, Okinawa Summit, July 2000.
- World Bank, "Critics see troubling poverty trends", press release, Washington, April 2002.
- World Bank, "Mongolia Country Report", Washington, Web page, 2001.
- World Bank, "Vietnam, Country Report", Washington, Web page, 2001.
- World Bank, "Social Capital" Thematic Group, Washington, 2003.

## 9 ANNEXES

# ANNEX 1 - LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

Surveys often do not indicate whether wells and springs are protected or unprotected. In these cases, the proportion of protected vs. unprotected was estimated, if possible by using other surveys for the same country. Similarly, surveys often do not indicate whether latrines are traditional or improved, covered or uncovered. In these cases, the proportion of improved or covered was estimated, if possible by using other surveys for that same country.

For countries with DHS surveys (Africa, Asia and Latin America), the construction materials for the floor, wall or roof was collected and used to estimate the durability of the dwelling. The nature of the floor most frequently determined durability, since many countries did not collect data on wall or roof materials. In most DHS surveys, three categories classify the nature of the floor: natural (dirt, earth), rudimentary (wood, plank) and modern (cement, polished wood). Here, only a house with a floor built with natural materials is considered not durable. Although we know that some house with floor made with rudimentary materials is not durable, we considered them as durable to avoid overestimating the number of slum dwellers.

For developed countries (Europe and North America), durability of housing has been assessed from the conditions of the wall or roof rather than the material used in construction. In developed countries the sources of data are more limited. For some European countries (Belgium, Germany, France, Yugoslavia) the UNSD Human Settlements Statistics 2001 Report and the UN-HABITAT Global Report on Human Settlements 2001 (Cities in a Globalizing World) provided information on temporary and marginal housing. In these reports a temporary housing unit has some of the facilities of conventional housing, while marginal housing units do not have many of the features of a conventional dwelling and are generally characterized as unfit for human habitation, but are being used for the purpose of habitation.

For Japan (Japanese Housing and Land Survey) and the USA (American Housing Survey 2001), information was provided on the condition of dwelling units. In the Japanese survey, the category of dilapidated housing was enumerated directly. In the American Housing Survey, the conditions of walls, floor and ceiling were noted. The American Housing Survey also enumerates the condition of the neighborhood. This information has been used to estimate the percentage of housing units to be classified as slum dwellings.

## Missing Value Estimation

### *Correlation between the percentage of overcrowded households and the mean number of persons per households*

Regression equations using DHS data show that the percentage of overcrowded households is strongly correlated with the mean number of persons per room in Africa as well as in Asia and Latin America. For these three regions, the regression equations are statistically similar, e.g. one regression equation from these three data sets is sufficient to estimate the overcrowding from the mean number of persons per room whatever the region. This finding is of interest since for most countries, only the mean number of persons per room is published in

national reports as well as in UNSD or UN-HABITAT reports. For these countries, we used the regression equation parameters to estimate the percentage of overcrowded households from the mean number of persons per room.

Example using regression equation for **Africa**:

$$y = 0.209x + 8.5221 \quad R^2 = 0.9032$$


y is the percentage of overcrowded households

$x = (z - 2) * 100$ , where z, is the mean of number of persons per room

If  $z = 2.50$ ,  $x = 50$  and  $y = 0.209 * 50 + 8.522 = 18.972$

This means that 19% of households have a mean number of persons per room higher than three.

**FIGURE 15**  
REGRESSION EQUATION FOR OVERCROWDING IN AFRICA




Example using regression equation for **Asia**

$$y = 0.213x + 7.409 \quad R^2 = 0.975$$

If  $z = 2.5$ ,  $x = 50$   $y = 0.213 * 50 + 7.409 = 18.075$

**FIGURE 16**  
REGRESSION EQUATION FOR OVERCROWDING IN ASIA




Example using regression equation for **Latin America**


$$y = 0.213x + 8.233 \quad R^2 = 0.973$$

If  $z = 2.5$ ,  $x = 50$   $y = 0.213 * 50 + 8.233 = 18.878$

**FIGURE 17**  
REGRESSION EQUATION FOR OVERCROWDING IN LATIN AMERICA



**FIGURE 18**  
REGRESSION EQUATION FOR OVERCROWDING IN THE WORLD



**Example using regression equation for all regions**

$$y = 0.211x + 8.228 \quad R^2 = 0.963$$

$$\text{If } z=2.5, x=50 \quad y = 0.211 \cdot 50 + 8.228 = 18.798$$

The percentages of overcrowded households estimated from Africa, Asia or Latin America are statistically equal.

# ANNEX 2

## Slum descriptions and definitions from 30 cities around the world (Information produced by consultants and consolidated by UN-HABITAT as case studies for The Global Report on Human Settlements “The Challenge of the Slums”, Nairobi, 2003)

### Ahmedabad

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>“Chawls”: originally the residential units build in the mill premises for workers.</p> <p>Slums: represent illegal occupation of marginal areas of the city by migrants and other economically weaker sections. Lack adequate facilities and basic amenities and are found along the riverfront, low-lying areas, vacant private/government land, etc.</p>	<p>According to the 49th round of NSSO (January-June 1993), a compact area with a collection of poorly built tenements, mostly of temporary nature, crowded together usually with inadequate sanitary and drinking water facilities in unhygienic conditions. Considered “undeclared slum”, if at least 20 households live in that area. Certain areas declared as slums by respective local bodies or development authorities are “declared slums”. The results reflect only the availability and not adequacy of the facilities available in the slum. The structures are identified as “pucca”, “katcha”, including unserviceable “katcha” and serviceable “katcha” and “semi-pucca” structure.</p>	<p>There are multi-storied concrete tenements called “Chawls”/“chalis” in Bombay and Ahmedabad, which are one room housing units constructed in a row to house the mill workers. Are also known as “katras” in Delhi, unsanitary, overcrowded ahas in “Kanpur”, “cheries” in Madras and “bustees” in Kolkata. In Maharashtra, slums are generally referred to as “zopadpattis”, while in northern India they are known as “jhuggis”.</p>

### Bangkok

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Few squatters, some slums on public land along river channels.</p>	<p>National Housing Authority: “a dirty, damply, swampy or unhealthy area with overcrowded buildings and dwellers which can be harmful for health or lives or can be source of unlawful or immoral actions. The minimum number of housing units per rai (1,600 sq. metres) is 30”.</p> <p>Bangkok Metropolitan Administration (since 1991): “an overcrowded, unorderedly and dilapidated community with unample environment which can be harmful for health and lives. The minimum number of housing units per rai is 15”. (<a href="http://www.nhanet.or.th/chs/homepoor.html">http://www.nhanet.or.th/chs/homepoor.html</a>). (1 rai = 1,600 sq.m.)</p>	<p>Components: overcrowded conditions, limited privacy, sub-standard housing and sub-standard environment.</p>

### Barcelona

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degraded housing in the centre of the old city.</li> <li>Shantytown housing, normally self-built in areas of wasteland around the then edges of the city (1960-80s, now vestigial).</li> <li>Multi-family residential blocks built from the 1950s onwards for (internal) immigrants.</li> <li>Temporary gypsy encampments in areas of waste ground in and around the city.</li> <li>Homeless people.</li> </ul>	<p>The Barcelona Municipal Government has no official written definition of slums, because it, in agreement with academics and NGO representatives (as discussed above), considers that the shantytowns, which constituted, historically, the main slums in the city, no longer exist, and that there are no slums (the Spanish term “barrios marginales”, or marginal neighbourhoods was used as the translation) as such, in the city. Rather, there are areas with higher indices of social inequality, but these cannot be considered to be slums (p. 10).</p>	<p>“Barrio Marginal” – marginal neighbourhood. A term commonly used to refer to all types of neighbourhoods, which suffer from severe social and economic problems. A similar term is “barrio degradado”, or degraded neighbourhood.</p> <p>“Barraca” – self-built, illegal housing made using non-durable material (cardboard, scrap wood and metal, etc). In the rest of Spain for the same phenomenon: chabola.</p> <p>“Polígono” – a publicly funded housing estate built on the peripheries of the city to house shantytown dwellers, immigrants, and other people in need of housing. This term refers, however, to any low-income housing development and not merely to those considered to suffer from slum conditions. A popular word referring to the same phenomenon, but with derogatory tones, and as such used more to refer to the polígonos with marked social problems is bloque, as in “vive en un bloque” (s/he lives in a housing estate, i.e. not in a normal flat).</p>

## Beirut

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slums that began as international refugee camps or low-income housing areas (instituted between 1920-1955).</li> <li>Slums that began as housing areas for Lebanese rural-urban migrations (1950-1972).</li> <li>Slums that began as camps organised to house foreign, low-income labour (1950).</li> <li>Slums that began as squats during the period of the civil war (1975-1990).</li> </ul>	<p>Few if any public references exist to slums, as we defined them above, in current public discourse (mentions some studies by UN agencies).</p>	<p>The terminology of "tanake" refers to the corrugated metal sheets used in the construction of these houses. Another notable definition of the term refers to the "kurdification" of neighbourhoods, as an indication of the arrival of low income residents and changes in their demography.</p> <p>After the war, people tend to associate "slums" to either the war, in which case refugees and displaced populations tend to be confounded under the terminology of "mouhajjareen" (Yahya 1994), or to fanatic, anti-state political attitudes with which they label their dwellers (Charafeddine 1985). A common vision among the Lebanese is that the residents of these settlements are "crooks" who are seeking to benefit from the indemnities of the Ministry of Displaced.</p>

## Bogotá


Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ones which correspond to the initial stages of the non-planned processes of urbanization in the peripheral and marginal areas.</li> <li>The deteriorated zones that can be identified within the central city (inner-city slums).</li> </ol>	<p>Synonymous: In the POT (Plan for Territorial Organization) the names for Informal Neighborhoods (DAPD 2000: 74), Subnormal Settlements (DAPD 2000: 111) and Settlements which Origin is Unknown (DAPD 2000: 159) are included. The Coordinated Unity for Housing Politics (2002) refers to them as Illegal Developments. Def. for all these terms: "Urban settlements in which the terrain's occupation and the development of it are done without any plan and without the corresponding permits and licenses officially required." Also "tugurios" but now less in use.</p> <p>For inner-city slums: "Social Deviation Zone", "Tolerance Zone" or "Pot", with the following definition: "Social deviation zones, tolerance zones or pot are the physical spaces of the cities in which live, mainly, human groups known to have delinquent behaviour, prostitution, or distribution and use of illegal drugs". (DAPD 1997: 68)</p>	<p>The most common forms of naming the slums make an allusion to those associations. "Marginal neighborhoods", "illegal neighborhoods", "misery belts", "pots", "holes", "neighborhoods of the poor", between others, are referring not only to the physical conditions of the places but also to their inhabitants.</p>

## Cairo

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Type A Informal Settlements on Former Agricultural Land.</p> <p>Type B Informal Settlements on Former Desert State Land.</p> <p>Type C Deteriorated Historic Core.</p> <p>Type D Deteriorated Urban Pockets.</p>	<p>The term "aashwa'i" is the only one used officially to indicate deteriorated or under-served urban areas. It actually means "random", implying that these areas are unplanned and illegally constructed.</p>	<p>The term "aashwa'i" has also become a synonym for slums in unofficial or popular language, and it carries a pejorative connotation. In addition, in general language, the term "shaabi" is used to describe popular or working class neighborhoods. Also, the term "baladi" is popularly used to describe areas where poorer inhabitants, especially those of rural origin, are found. Neither of these two latter terms has a particularly negative connotation, except perhaps with reference to modern real estate markets.</p>

## Chengdu

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The low-lying shanties in the city's center.</li> <li>The heavy industrial zone in the city's east suburbs.</li> <li>The habitats of the migrant people in the city's border area.</li> </ul>	<p>Low-lying shanties: they appear in official documents and the media.</p> <p>Intersection of urban and rural areas: they appear in official documents and the media. (p. 5)</p>	<p><b>DIVIDED WITH STREETS:</b> A certain street is the equivalent of slums. For example, the Liuyin Street was considered a slum because it had many low-lying shanties.</p> <p><b>DIVIDED WITH HABITATS:</b> In Chengdu, people who live in the city's western and southern parts are rich and those who live in its eastern and northern parts are poor. For a long time, living on the bank of the Fu and Nan Rivers also meant the status of the urban poor.</p> <p><b>DIVIDED WITH LIVING CONDITIONS:</b> A place with a concentration of one-story houses was considered a slum. Traditionally, Chengdu people called owners of one-story houses "owners of door planks."</p> <p><b>DIVIDED WITH PROFESSION:</b> The formation of a community is associated with professions. Most of the physical workers in collective enterprises such as co-operatives lived in slums.</p>



## Colombo

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p><b>Slums:</b> Old deteriorating tenements or subdivided derelict houses. The slums tenements, built mostly of permanent materials, are very often single roomed and compactly arranged, in back to back rows. The occupants have a definite legal status of occupancy.</p> <p><b>Shanties:</b> Improvised and unauthorized shelters, constructed by the urban squatters on state or privately owned land, without any legal rights of occupancy. The areas are badly serviced and very often unsanitary.</p> <p><b>Un-serviced semi-urban neighborhoods:</b> Badly serviced residential areas in the sub-urban areas of Colombo and secondary towns. One difference from the squatter areas is that residents of these settlements have definite legal titles and sizes of the plots of these occupants are relatively larger than the shanties.</p> <p><b>Labour lines or derelict living quarters:</b> These are derelict housing areas belonging to the local authority or government agencies occupied by the temporary or casual labourers. These settlements are in un-sanitary and derelict condition due to lack of maintenance over a long period of time.</p> <p><b>UMP/UN-HABITAT/DFID funded Urban Poverty Reduction Project in 2001:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor Settlements</li> <li>• Un-serviced Settlements</li> <li>• Upgraded Settlements</li> <li>• Fully upgraded Settlements</li> </ul> <p><b>Clean Settlement Programme Unit of the Ministry of Urban Development and Housing in 1998/99 *(REEL data base):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slums</li> <li>• Shanties</li> <li>• Low-cost Flats</li> <li>• Relocated Housing</li> <li>• Old deteriorated Quarters</li> <li>• Unplanned Permanent Dwellings</li> </ul>	<p>In official documents, mostly low-income settlements are identified according to the different types of settlement arrangements as Slums, Shanties, Upgraded Settlements, Relocated Settlements or low-cost flats.</p> <p>Slums: Old tenements, erected to accommodate the influx of a new labour force into the city during a period when a thriving plantation industry required labour for processing, packaging, and storage, handling and shipping. Tenement units normally consist of a single bedroom, a small veranda, and a living area with common water taps and latrine facilities. They were usually built in rows on a block of land commonly referred to as a garden. These so called tenements contain anything between a group of two or three units and a few hundreds arranged in rows.</p> <p>Old residential buildings (slum houses) - In former residential areas, mainly in older parts of Colombo North and Central (e.g., Pettah, Hultsdorp, Wolfendhal) - later turned into apartments for low-income workers. They were subdivided into small units, inadequately maintained and largely deprived of basic sanitary facilities.</p> <p>Shanties: According to the Policy Paper on Slum and Shanty Upgrading of 1979, the collection of small, single-unit improvised structures constructed with non-durable materials on vacant land throughout the city. Shanties illegally occupy state or private land, usually with no regular water, sanitation or electricity supply; the majority are built on land subject to frequent flooding.</p>	<p>"Watta" in local language is the common term that is being used for both slums and shanty settlements in Colombo by the general public. English translation of 'Watta' is Garden. Captain Garden, Ali watta, Kadirana watta are some examples of names used for Colombo slums and shanties.</p> <p>Old residential buildings: In local Language this type of settlement arrangement is called "Mudukku". People who are living these types of houses do not like to call their houses by the official name or the popular local term "Mudukku". They usually call these houses 'Row Houses' (Peli Gewal).</p> <p>Shanties: In local language this type of settlement arrangement is called as 'Pelpath'. This term reflects a group people who are living more difficult conditions and poverty than "Mudukku" or slums according to the common usage.</p>

## Durban

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
	<p>The provincial Department of Housing defines slums as both "erstwhile formal settlements that have degenerated to such an extent that there exists a need to rehabilitate them to acceptable levels" as well as being "loosely used to refer to an informal settlement" (Department of Housing, KwaZulu-Natal, 2002). While there is no definitive statement of what an informal settlement is, factors taken into consideration when "classifying" an area as such comprise an evaluation of the nature of the structure, land-ownership, tenure situation, size of structure, access to services and land use zoning (Makhathini et al, 2002).</p>	<p>The Zulu popular language term for an informal dwelling is "umjondolo" (plural "imijondolos").</p> <p>Although the term "slum" has recently regained new currency in some political circles, it is politically problematic in the South African context because successive waves of Apartheid social engineering have, over the years, been justified in terms of "slum upgrading". The term slum tends to represent something that devalues the foothold that the poor have achieved in the urban economy and provides the justification for external or technocratic forms of intervention rather than socio-political solutions (p. 8f) - informal settlement preferred.</p>

## Guatemala City

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Settlement in private lands, , not authorized by the municipality, because they were located in high pending, in focuses of contamination and are sold without any service.</li> <li>Settlement of invasions and occupations of state or private lands.</li> <li>Low cost, government housing projects with green areas occupied by squatters.</li> <li>Originally rural villages absorbed by city of Guatemala, lacking services.</li> <li>Private proprietor leases land without providing services.</li> <li>Occupation with permission: permission given to settle on state land.</li> </ul>	<p>"Asentamientos humanos precarios" - Precarious human settlements.</p> <p>"Barrios urbanos marginales" - Marginal urban neighborhoods.</p> <p>Without being official, they usually are denominated: scarce resources colony or poor neighborhoods, when the settlements already have most of these services, they are proprietors of the land and they have a formal housing.</p>	<p>The language terms more common are:</p> <p>"Asentamiento": settlement.</p> <p>"Barrio marginal": marginal neighborhood.</p> <p>"Palomar": dovecote.</p> <p>Other terms used are:</p> <p>"Toma": Invasion of lands.</p> <p>"Champa": precarious housing, built for themselves with waste material .</p>

## Havana

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Housing types:</p> <p>"Cuarterías". The typical inner city slum dwelling unit is a room in a cuartería, ciudadela, pasaje, solar, or casa de vecindad. It is usually a single room with shared bathing and sanitary facilities in a common courtyard or passageway.</p> <p>"Bohíos". Almost non-existent in Havana, "bohíos" are thatched roof shacks that were once common in rural areas. Partly considered as "barrios insalubres".</p> <p>Improvised housing. Dwelling units built mostly of scrap materials are considered "improvised".</p> <p>Settlement types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Barrios insalubres".</li> <li>Transitional homeless shelters.</li> </ul>	<p>"Tugurio" - slum officially never used in Cuba.</p> <p>The National Housing Institute considers units in "cuarterías" and "barrios" and "focos insalubres" to be the "precarious housing stock".</p>	<p>People use solar instead of "cuartería" or barrio "insalubre".</p>



UN-HABITAT Project Agenda 21

## Ibadan


Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The oldest and biggest slum is the core area of the city, which covers the entire pre-colonial town. A large part of the ancient walled city can be seen as a slum, even if the inhabitants do not agree that they live in a slum for historical reasons.</li> <li>A few small-scale slums, on land occupied illegally by squatters, can be found at the margins of the planned city.</li> <li>Numerous slums, generally occupied by tenants on legal lands, are found at the outskirts of the city along major roads or close to local labour markets. Their size, history, socio-economic and cultural features differ from one slum to another.</li> </ul>	<p>Although local government chairmen recognize the existence of slums in their city, there is no official definition and apparently no official document, which could inform the phenomenon of slum in the city.</p> <p>People from the inner city call the area "Ipile Ibadan" (origin of Ibadan), "Adugbo Atiyo" (old area) and "Inu Igboro Ibadan" (inner area of Ibadan). Nobody from inside will call the place a slum because of the social stigma such a term represents.</p> <p>Hausa people will use the terms "Karakara" (fallen branches) or "bukoki" (mud houses), which originally meant areas where the majority of the houses are made of straw and fallen branches.</p>	<p>Poor areas are almost always associated with high-density area, mountains of refuse, lack or scarcity of electricity and water, deterioration of housing conditions as well as overcrowding.</p>

## Karachi

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Unplanned areas are known as "katchi abadis" (non-permanent settlements):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Settlements established through unorganized invasions of state lands at the time of partition. Most of them were removed and relocated in the 1960s. Almost all of them have been regularised.</li> <li>Informal subdivisions of state land (ISD). These ISDs can be further divided into two:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notified "katchi abadis": have been earmarked for regularisation</li> <li>Non-notified "katchi abadis": These are settlements that are not to be regularised because they are on land the state requires for development, etc.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>The Government of Pakistan recognizes only two terms related to unserviced or under-serviced settlements. These are:</p> <p>"Katchi abadis": These are informal settlements created through squatting or ISDs on state or private land. These settlements are of two types: i) notified katchi abadis, for which the government has a Katchi Abadi Regularisation and Improvement Programme (KAIRP); and ii) "katchi abadis" which cannot be regularised for reasons explained in Section B-1.</p> <p>Slums: The government definition of a slum is an informal settlement created through the ISDs of agricultural land. Unlike the "katchi abadis", these settlements have tenure security. In Karachi, these settlements consist of villages that have become part of the urban sprawl and/or the ISDs created out on their community and agricultural land. So far, there is no programme to improve conditions in these settlements except for those which, through political patronage, have been declared as "katchi abadis".</p>	<p>The word katchi abadis is a popular local language term used by generally all residents of the city to define low-income as well as deprived settlements. These may be legal or illegal.</p>

### Slums

i) Inner city traditional pre-Independence working class areas, which have now densified to an extent that, their infrastructure has collapsed or cannot serve them adequately. ii) Goths or old villages, which have now become a part of the urban sprawl. Those within or near the city centre have become part of formal development schemes and are not considered as slums. Others have developed informally into inadequately serviced high density working class areas



Rasna Warah

## Khartoum

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inter – city slum areas: these are either engulfed or annexed by urban expansion. The residents of some (e.g., “Fallata” (of Nigerian origin) village have been moved further out and the area redeveloped and planned. Others have been replanned and residents were allowed to stay e.g., “Diyoun”.</li> <li>Outer slums: areas planned by the authorities and distributed to the landless. Living conditions are worse than the first.</li> <li>Squatter settlements: land illegally occupied by new comers. Conditions here are the worst. Temporary shelters built of cardboard, tin and sacks.</li> </ul> <p>The second category is the most dominant, and the last occupies a considerable area.</p>	<p>Official term used is “squatter” as an umbrella for all types of illegal residence. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Carton (cardboard) and “safeeh” (tin) camps; these are the poorest slums on public or other people's land.</li> <li>2) Large fenced land with or without room, reserved by land speculators (for sale or rent) and claiming its ownership through heritage.</li> <li>3) Old villages incorporated in the urban centre, occupied by people who have customary rights. These are now being replanned and residents given ownership rights.</li> <li>4) Planned squatter settlement; these emerge when authorities resettle squatter or displaced population, and give them ownership rights.</li> <li>5) Luxurious squatter erected by dignitaries on public land.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Carton (cardboard) villages.</li> <li>2- “Safeih” (tin) villages.</li> <li>3- “Ishash” (huts).</li> <li>4- “Galoos” (mud) buildings.</li> <li>5- “Shammasa” (people living the sun).</li> </ol>

## Kolkata

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Bustee dwellers having entered the city much before the growth of industrialisation, to serve British families, dwellings close to posh areas.</p> <p>Bustees being the outcome of industrialisation, so-called Thika tenants, with land rented to slum dwellers by middlemen (zamindar) sometimes including renting of huts.</p> <p>Refugee Resettlement Colony (locally called as “udbastu” colony) where land has been leased out for 99 years to the erstwhile migrants of present Bangladesh by the Government on nominal rent.</p> <p>Encroachment of road side (Jhupri), Canal (khaldhar), Maidan or any vacant place (udbastu) by the poor people either displaced from the city itself or retrenched from their working place. Another type of displacement is reported as displacement due to excessive increase in family size.</p>	<p>Slum: Slum area (Improvement and Clearance) Act, 1956, Government of India: areas where buildings are in any respect unfit for human habitation.</p> <p>“Compendium of Environment Statistics, 1997” CSO, Government of India: a slum is defined as an aerial unit having 25 or more katcha structures mostly of temporary nature or 50 or more households residing mostly in katcha structures huddled together or inhabited persons with practically no private latrine and inadequate public latrine and water facilities.</p> <p>Bustee: Definition of the Kolkata Municipal Corporation Act 1980, area containing land not less than seven hundred square metres in area occupied by or for the purposes of any collection of huts or other structures used or intended to be used for human habitation.</p>	<p>Bustees: officially authorized slums.</p> <p>Squatter settlements (along canals, etc.): not officially authorized, worse off than bustees.</p> <p>60 kathas – 1 acre</p>



## Lima

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Three types of buildings with physical deterioration and overcrowding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solares (o tugurios) located in the core historic part of the cities.</li> <li>• Solares located in areas which are not considered as historic</li> <li>• Modern buildings with severe crowding. These type of buildings are rare, but they are increasing overtime.</li> <li>• Pueblos jóvenes: not necessarily densely populated but with low social prestige</li> </ul>	<p>Officially, it refers to the historic part of the city, but there is some confusion between the non-deteriorated core part of the city and the deteriorated one, which is not necessarily a historic part.</p> <p>The original documents of planning utilize the term "tugurio" to classify these areas and the large public knows them likewise.</p> <p>The studies done by the Metropolitan Planning Office of Lima (PLANDEMET) in 1968 distinguished various types of deteriorated housing (vivienda deteriorada, callejón, corralón...).</p>	<p>The terms "tugurio" and "pueblo joven" are the most utilized by most of the actors in the city. For the middle class and the press, the names of some poor neighborhoods at the periphery of Lima, and other historic neighborhoods in town and the Callao, are associated with poverty and criminality.</p> <p>For the youth people living in the "pueblos jóvenes", it is often convenient not to identify with the district where they live when they are searching for jobs in the wealthy parts of the city.</p> <p>The media is currently propagating a biased vision of the "pueblos jóvenes" of the city. This vision corresponds to the reality of the 1960s and 1970s and it has been maintaining this distorted vision over time. For most of the journalists, the "pueblos jóvenes" are not consolidated (in terms of basic service provision and other amenities), however most of them are. The population is basically immigrants (second generation). The land that they occupied is "private" even if originally it was (or still is) public land, which was occupied by squatting. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the authorities themselves created the biggest human settlements there.</p>

## Los Angeles

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low-density Disinvested Areas: Neighbourhoods with primarily single-family and duplex housing (1-2 units).</li> <li>• Mid-density Disinvested Areas: Neighbourhoods with primarily mid-density housing (3-19 units).</li> <li>• High-density Disinvested Areas: Neighbourhoods with primarily multifamily housing (20 units or more).</li> <li>• High-density (Skid Row): A 50 - block area in the Eastern part of Los Angeles's central business district that has a high level of homeless residents and single-room occupancy hotels.</li> <li>• Mixed-density Disinvested Areas: Neighbourhoods in which neither high, mid nor low-density buildings are dominant.</li> </ul>	<p>Official use of the word "slum" to describe deteriorated housing conditions in the City of Los Angeles has generally been used in reference to disinvested buildings, not neighbourhoods.</p> <p>Probably the most important official terminology used to describe neighbourhoods with deteriorated physical and social conditions is "blight." In line with Urban Renewal policies encouraged by the U.S. federal government, the Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles (CRA/LA) was formed in 1948 to identify areas of physical blight and stimulate investment through geographically targeted programmes.</p>	<p>Community activists and persons working on improving slums tend to see them as physically deteriorated buildings.</p> <p>"Hood" is a term used by African American youth.</p> <p>Traditional Latino neighbourhoods have long been referred to with the Spanish term, "barrio".</p>

## Lusaka

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The early Self-Help Housing: emerged on land allocated specifically to low-income self-help housing on the outskirts of the main urban settlements in the post - 1948 did not insist on the statutory building standards.</li> <li>• Unauthorised Housing: similar low building standard, no access to municipal services.</li> </ul>	Not given (MR)	See slum types (MR)

## Manila

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
Still missing (MR 05.08.02)	<p>The Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC) defines slums as buildings or areas that are deteriorated, hazardous, unsanitary or lacking in standard conveniences. These were also defined as the squalid, crowded or unsanitary conditions under which people live, irrespective of the physical state of the building or area.</p> <p>Presidential Decree 772 was the legislation that criminalized squatting and gave birth to an official definition for another breed of illegal occupants. Professional squatters are referred to as individuals or groups who occupy lands without the expressed consent of the landowner and who have sufficient income for the legitimate housing. The term also applies to persons who have been previously awarded home lots or housing units by the government but who sold, leased or transferred the same and settled illegally in the same place or in another urban area as non-bonafide occupants and intruders of land for socialized housing. The term shall not apply to individuals or groups who simply rent land and housing from professional squatting syndicates.</p>	<p>Slums have no direct equivalent in the local language. These are better referred to in terms of descriptive words, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Iskwater” (Tagalog version of squatter referring to a physically disorganized collection of shelters made of light and often visually unappealing materials where poor people reside).</li> <li>• “Estero” (narrower than sewers and associated with bad smell).</li> <li>• “Eskinita” (refers to alleys that fit only one person at a time).</li> <li>• “Looban” (meaning inner areas where houses are built so close to each other and often in a manner not visible to the general view of the city).</li> <li>• “Dagat-dagatan” (for areas frequently flooded).</li> </ul>

## Marseille

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
Between the two categories (private, public), still exists, in depreciated territories, housing out of standards, precarious or ancient and decayed (chinkal housing or third housing market after private and social housing markets).		<p>Chinkal housing</p> <p>Taudis (shantytown)</p>




## Mexico City

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Irregular settlements: "asentamientos irregulares" or "colonias populares" ("irregular settlements" or "popular colonies")</p> <p>"Vecindades" or inner city tenements: the traditional slum and present-day rented housing.</p> <p>"Ciudades perdidas" ("lost cities"): a broad concept referring to a wide variety of small-scale pockets of shanty housing occupying odd pieces of publicly owned land, such as alongside railway lines, in the public thoroughfare and under pylons, or in plots of land in otherwise built-up neighbourhoods. Most of the "ciudades perdidas" have been eradicated.</p> <p>"Cuartos de azotea" or "rooftop homes": mainly servants quarters and makeshift housing on the flat roofs of apartment buildings and early public housing projects.</p> <p>Social housing.</p>	No official definition.	No unofficial definition. Report uses indicators from census information.


## Moscow

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Squatter flats are the result of wrong usage of housing stock undertaken by owners/tenants who practice illegal sub rent.</li> <li>Shabby and Dilapidated Houses resulted from the wrong maintenance.</li> <li>Communal Flats were understood as temporally measure to accommodate important human recourses.</li> <li>Temporary shelter, dormitories or barracks for workers. These "barracks" and "obschagi" are still occupied by poor residents who could find no strength, no recourses to move out.</li> <li>Primitive industrial houses of the first generation are the legacy of soviet period that nowadays looks outdated and miss modern building codes for housing.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Communal flats" in Russian "communalky" are flats used by two or more families in share a common kitchen and other premises. This standard of living is now appropriate only for short time residence: hotels, hostels and dormitories.</li> <li>"Shabby and dilapidated" buildings in Russian "vethi and avariyni" are buildings recognized as unsuitable for constant residing usually because of damaged constructions that are not safe. People registered as inhabitants of such dwellings have a right to ask for free housing. They are listed in a line of "required home residents" or "ocheredniki" in a queue for housing improvement.</li> <li>"Morally Outdated and Deteriorated" are usually called prefabricated concrete 5-storey houses of the "first generation" of mass construction. They were built with very modest standards both in spatial parameters and constructions. Those standards - "norms and requirements for buildings" are outdated compared with modern standards for housing</li> <li>"Bomji" people without permanent address.</li> <li>The Resettlement of people from shabby and dilapidated housing stock means to provide them with housing accommodation adequate to modern standards.</li> </ol>	<p>"Hrushebi" that is a vulgar nickname for Modest industrial houses of the first generation build in a Hruschev time (N. Hruschev was a Soviet leader 1956-1962).</p> <p>"Baraks" – primitive houses built usually for construction workers for the period of construction. In people's attitude the lowest possible civilised houses.</p> <p>People without permanent shelter "Bomji" – use abandoned and ruined buildings as temporally shelter. These types of structures are not mentioned on official reports and could not be found in the maps. Actually, they could survive and be used for several years before construction comes to the site.</p>

## Mumbai

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>"Chawls": rental tenements constructed in Mumbai by factory and landowners for low-income workers between 1920 and 1956. One-room tenements with a cooking place and shared common lavatories were provided and meant to house mostly single men for nominal rents. With consolidation of male migrants in the city, their families joined them. Consequently, densities of these single room tenements increased phenomenally and structures began to deteriorate very fast.</p> <p>"Patra chawls": Consist of mainly semi-permanent structures, which are both of authorized and unauthorized types</p> <p>"Zopadpattis" (squatters): These are the most predominant low-income informal settlements falling under the category of slum.</p> <p>Pavement Dwelling: Pavement Dwellers are households, dominated by single male migrants living in hutments built on the footpaths of Mumbai's roads close to places of employment. Not eligible for improvement schemes and often faced harassment and demolition.</p>	<p>Although pavement dwellers and chawls have poor slum like conditions, these do not fall under the legal definition of "slum".</p>	
		

## Nairobi

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Slums in Nairobi are known as "Vijiji", a term that corresponds to the world "village".</p>	<p>There is no official definition of slums or informal settlements.</p> <p>City authorities view lack of basic services and infrastructure, as characteristics of slums, an aspect that slum dwellers do not put emphasis on.</p>	<p>The Matrix study of 1993 provides a summary of characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structure owners have either a quasi-legal right of occupation or no rights at all.</li> <li>• Structures are constructed largely of temporary materials and do not conform to minimum standards.</li> <li>• Majority of the structures are let on a room-to-room basis and the majority of households occupy single rooms.</li> <li>• Densities are high, typically 250 units per hectare compared to 25 per hectare in middle-income areas and 15 per hectare in high income areas.</li> <li>• Physical layouts are relatively haphazard making it difficult to provide infrastructure.</li> <li>• The majority of the inhabitants have low or very low incomes.</li> <li>• Urban services such as water and sanitation are non-existent or minimal</li> </ul> <p>Morbidity and mortality rates caused by diseases stemming from environmental conditions are significantly higher than in other areas of the city.</p> <p>Pamoja Trust includes the concept of temporary structures, insecure tenure, overcrowding, and poorly constructed housing.</p>
		

## Naples

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p><b>Historic residential periphery:</b> This area comprises quarters, which developed in the early 1900s near the industrial areas, which have now closed.</p> <p><b>Recent public city:</b> public housing, having been planned in the 1960s and finished after the earthquake. Bad reputation. Socially, the decision to concentrate large numbers of residents with problems in a single area, depriving them of the social capital they possessed in their original neighbourhoods, turned out to be a serious problem. "The sails", huge twenty-storey housing blocks, turned out to be uninhabitable and two have already been demolished.</p> <p><b>Unauthorized city:</b> The best known case of wildcat construction is Pianura, a neighbourhood which sprung up in the '70s and '80s, when 5-7 storey buildings were built without authorization from the city, in an area that the zoning plan had classified as agricultural. Illegal homes only in the technical sense, since they had no building permits and violated the zoning plan; the land was legally bought by private developers that respected building standards. With the connivance of the authorities they were linked to the public water and electric system, and later to the sewer system.</p> <p><b>New periphery:</b> mixed suburban growth, gated communities of US Army, illegal construction, low density</p> <p><b>Decaying central pockets:</b> A slow and gradual exodus has been taking place, accompanied by an ageing of the population. The most vulnerable segments of the population (the very young and the elderly) now meet in a zone where the socio-economic fabric is deeply damaged, with a high density of inhabitants, high rates of vacancy, crumbling apartments and buildings. High risk of exclusion.</p> <p><b>Gypsy camps:</b> at the edge of the cities, built with non-permanent material.</p>	<p>No official definition of slum can be found, nor of specific decaying areas, even if the debate over this question has been raging for the past century in Naples.</p>	<p>The popular perception of a slum or marginal area is quite different, and always refers to a collective and spatial dimension: Neapolitans see as a slum any urban area from which "gentlemen", the middle class or those above have disappeared, where there are no collective spaces animated by trade and services. Housing quality does not seem to be important in this perception while, at least secondary, consideration is given to the time and means needed to get to the centre. This perception coincides perfectly with that of the middle class, which also defines a slum in terms of housing quality (light and air, size), giving this latter consideration more weight.</p>



Timurtaş Önan/Topham Picturepoint/UNEP

## Phnom Penh

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>Squatters on public land: these settlements developed alongside relatively wide streets, railway tracks, riversides, and boengs (water reservoirs used to irrigate farmland during dry season).</p> <p>Slums on private land: small clusters of families settled in disaffected alleys of better-off districts, while other groups squat in dilapidated, multiple-occupancy buildings in the centre of the city, where owners wait to sell the building for commercial development.</p> <p>Rooftop dwellers: Increasingly, urban poor also informally purchase plots on the rooftops of these buildings where they squat relatively close to their place of work.</p> <p>Squatters in rural fringe: since 1995, new rural migrants develop squatter areas on the rural fringe of the city, on non-constructible public land where long-term occupation may provide them some tenure rights.</p>	<p>Until 2000, the Municipality of Phnom Penh categorized slums into illegal "squatter" and "urban poor" settlements with a recognized occupancy status. The irony of such a definition is that there is no clear distinction between legal and illegal occupancy in Phnom Penh, since all private ownership of land was abolished in 1974, and no clear ownership system has been implemented since then.</p> <p>The term "squatter", long used in Phnom Penh to classify most inhabitants of low-income settlements yet conveys much more than a connotation of illegality. In Khmer, it refers to "people living in anarchy", and is strongly linked to immorality, disorder and criminality. In 2000, Prime Minister Hun Sen yet renamed squatter dwellers as "temporary residents", while publicly recognizing their economic value to the city.</p>	<p>See old official definition for squatter (negative connotations).</p>

## Quito

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>"Barrios periféricos" (popular neighbourhoods located in the urban edge). Most of the low-income households are located in the "barrios periféricos".</p> <p>"Conventillos" (deteriorated tenements in the Historic Centre).</p> <p>Rural neighbourhoods that house low-income families commuting to the urban area.</p>	<p>For the case of popular neighbourhoods located on the urban edge that have been developed informally the Municipality defines them as "barrios ilegales" (illegal settlements). In this case, the Municipality is undergoing a massive process of land regularization. In relation with loans and subsidies, low-income housing is known as "vivienda de interés" social (social housing).</p>	<p>The common names for slums are: "barrios populares" (popular neighbourhoods), "barrios periféricos" (peripheral neighbourhoods), "barrios clandestinos" (clandestine neighbourhoods), "invasiones" (squatter settlements), "conventillos" (inner city slums), and "barrios rurales" (rural neighbourhoods).</p>

## Rabat-Sale

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>"Fondouks": there is a particular type of construction which used to be places for transit, trade, hotel trade and which have become inhabited places which are highly populated and deteriorated.</p> <p>Intra-muros old slums: There are slums - precarious buildings in sheet metal or adobe - on rented or squatted plots of land which usually date back to the 1960s.</p> <p>Peripheral slums: Though initially, they are nearly the same than the above-mentioned slums (precarious buildings in sheet-metal or adobe, on rented or squatted plots of land), they are more recently built or at least, they have recently been extended. (The last constructions date back to the end of the 1970s, like Karyane el oued in Salé). Their peculiarity lies in the fact that they are less equipped and their urban integration is lower than that of the afore-mentioned.</p> <p>Illegal districts (clandestine): They have a complex status. There are concrete buildings which more or less resemble traditional buildings or cheap houses, but the difference is that they have been built on purchased plots of land but without any permit. Because they are illegal, these districts are also often deprived of the basic collective equipment and infrastructure (depending on how old they are and on whether they are going through a legalisation process).</p>	<p>Five categories are officially defined:</p> <p>Slums: any settlement of precarious housing (corrugated iron, adobe, wood, mixture ...) either on private plots of land, or with the settlers being provisionally tolerated on State- or district-owned plots of land.</p> <p>Illegal housing districts: any settlement in concrete, which has been built without any permit on a privately acquired plot of land.</p> <p>Old deteriorated fabric ("méquinas").</p> <p>Peri-urban "douars": same precarious materials or extended squatting as in "slums".</p> <p>Diffuse insalubrity: occupancy of premises, which are not meant for living in like bedrooms in hotels, etc.</p>	<p>The most emblematic form of slum, whatever social category talks about it, is "bidonville" in French. This word is used to refer to one particular category in the frame of intervention policies. In literary Arabic, there are different words to refer to it but the most usual one is "mudun safi" - literally metal towns. More generally, their inhabitants themselves call them "brarek" (huts) or "karyan" (quarry).</p> <p>Besides, projection on the deteriorated type of housing is also carried out on the mentality and behaviour of the slum dwellers, who are viewed as deviants, thieves, bandits - in a word, as dangerous people. Deteriorated housing and deteriorated morality are considered as one. In the same line, these people are regarded by the upper and middle class people as "savages", uneducated and uncivil; thus, the creation of rather strong terms like "lahbach" (in dialectal Arabic, meaning "to be erased from the map").</p> <p>The second most visible and most discussed form is illegal housing which, in Morocco, is called in French habitat "clandestin" - quite euphemistic a term considering the great visibility of these districts. In Arabic, they are called "medina achouaia" (literally, non-organized, messy town).</p> <p>There are no specific terms for slums of the "medina"; only the word "fondouks" is used.</p>


## Rio de Janeiro

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>"Favelas" (squatter settlements): as highly consolidated invasions of public or private land with auto-construction developed by the poor in land lacking infrastructure and without following any kind of plans.</p> <p>"Loteamentos irregulares/ clandestinos" (illegal subdivisions): These are illegal subdivisions of land that lack infrastructure and do not comply with planning rules, but normally have some kind of urban physical order.</p> <p>"Invasões (invasions)": Irregular occupation of public or private land, still in process of consolidation. Frequently takes place in environmentally fragile areas – riverbanks, swamps and hills or in residual areas of public equipment – under viaducts, at parks, beside roads and motorways).</p> <p>"Cortiços": Occupation by poor people of historical buildings that frequently are under litigation. Several families that share toilets, kitchen and laundry facilities occupy them.</p> <p>In many areas of the city, like in the east, it is difficult to distinguish the differences and boundaries of one type from the other.</p>	<p>Subnormal settlements (aglomerado subnormal) according to de Statistical Bureau (IBGE) are groups of 50 or more housing units located in a dense and disorderly manner, on land that belongs to third people, lacking infrastructure and services.</p>	<p>Poor people that live in slums clearly identify two main categories - the illegal subdivisions ("loteamentos irregulares") and the "favelas" (squatter settlements). In the illegal subdivisions people build illegally in a plot they have acquired lacking infrastructure and resulting from an illegal process of subdivision of land that do not comply with mandatory urban regulations. In a "favela" people acquire a shack or a slab, where they will make extensions or increase the number of floors.</p> <p>There is a common understanding that all that has an irregular appearance is poorly built or lack infrastructure is a "favela". Even some housing estates that have suffered with uncontrolled changes have been acquiring the aspect of a "favela", meaning a run down accommodation. Other local terms:</p> <p>"Cortiço", "Favela" and "Morro".</p> <p>"Comunidade": general term frequently used to refer slums used by NGOs and slum dwellers themselves.</p> <p>"Loteamento": to distinguish someone that lives in a settlement more regularly than a "favela".</p> <p>"Vilas periféricas": recent typology, frequent in the periphery of the city that is constituted by a row of bedrooms shared kitchen and laundry facilities.</p> <p>"Vila, Parque and Jardim": term used recently to name old illegal subdivisions that have received public infrastructure and services.</p>



## Sao Paulo

Types of slums	Official 'slum' definition(s)	Unofficial definition(s)
<p>"Favela": form of housing whose ownership in general is the dweller's, even if it is located on an invaded lot (whether public or private land) and without security of tenure, of "owner occupation", defined as "building a house or shack in a squatter settlement". Unlike in Rio de Janeiro, it is a recent phenomenon, less than 50 years old and whose current, sharp growth dates back to 1980.</p> <p>"Cortiço": precarious rented housing, rented room in subdivided inner-city tenement building</p>	<p>Municipality: "Favelas" are agglomerations of dwelling with reduced dimensions, built with inadequate materials (old wood, tin, cans and even cardboard) distributed irregularly in lots almost always lacking urban and social services and equipment, forming a complex social, economic, sanitary, educational and urban order". It was agreed upon that those agglomerations with up to 10 domiciles would be denominated "nucleuses".</p> <p>"Cortiço" is defined as a unit used as a collective, multifamily dwelling; totally or partially presenting the following characteristics: a) made up of one or more buildings constructed on an urban lot; b) subdivided in several rented, sub-letted or ceded on any ground whatsoever; c) several functions performed in the same room; d) common access and use of non-constructed spaces and sanitary installations; e) in general, precarious circulation and infrastructure; f) overcrowding of persons".</p> <p>IBGE: considers "favela" to be a "subnormal agglomeration", which is "a group made up of over 50 housing units located in lots belonging to others (public or private), with disorderly and dense occupation, in general lacking essential public services". No specific definition for "cortiço".</p>	<p>Both "favelas" and "cortiços" are popularly seen as a space for the city's "shady characters, bums, troublemakers and dirty". The prejudice is quite ingrained, especially among neighbours, who see their property devalued by the cortiço or "favela".</p> <p>The image of the "favela" dweller is confused with that of the "marginal" (and not so much with the crook or trafficker, as in Rio de Janeiro).</p> <p>Contrary to the "cortiço", that even in poor conditions is recognized as a building, "favela" housing is a simple "shack", a fragile construction that could be torn down either by the rain or a bulldozer. Likewise, "cortiços" are almost always located in the formal city, facing an asphalted street with a gutter, while the "favela", full of alleys and winding paths is seen as a "hiding place for bandits and criminals", through which few dare to pass.</p> <p>For favela: "favela", "community", "nucleus".</p> <p>For cortiço: "cortiço", "boarding house" (casa de cômodos), "pension" (pensão), "backyard" (quintal), "collective housing" (moradia coletiva).</p>



# ANNEX 3 - STATISTICAL TABLES

**Table 1(a): Population of slum areas at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Major area, region and country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>WORLD</b>	<b>6,134,124</b>	<b>2,923,184</b>	<b>47.7</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>923,986</b>
<b>Developed regions</b>	<b>1,193,737</b>	<b>901,519</b>	<b>75.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>54,068</b>
Europe	726,315	534,263	73.6	6.2	33,062
Other	467,422	367,256	78.6	5.7	21,006
<b>Developing regions</b>	<b>4,940,387</b>	<b>2,021,665</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>869,918</b>
Northern Africa	145,581	75,693	52.0	28.2	21,355
Sub-Saharan Africa	667,022	231,052	34.6	71.9	166,208
Latin America and the Caribbean (including Bermuda)	526,657	399,385	75.8	31.9	127,567
Eastern Asia	1,364,438	533,182	39.1	36.4	193,824
Eastern Asia (excluding China)	79,466	61,255	77.1	25.4	15,568
South-central Asia	1,506,725	452,484	30.0	58.0	262,354
South-eastern Asia	529,764	202,854	38.3	28.0	56,781
Western Asia	192,445	124,943	64.9	33.1	41,331
Oceania	7,755	2,072	26.7	24.1	499
<b>Transition countries</b>	<b>410,957</b>	<b>258,536</b>	<b>62.9</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>24,831</b>
Commonwealth of Independent States	282,639	181,182	64.1	10.3	18,714
Other Europe	128,318	77,354	60.3	7.9	6,116
<b>Least Developed Countries (LDCs)</b>	<b>684,615</b>	<b>179,239</b>	<b>26.2</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>140,114</b>
<b>Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs)</b>	<b>275,262</b>	<b>83,708</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>47,303</b>
<b>Small Island Developing States (SIDS)</b>	<b>51,894</b>	<b>30,027</b>	<b>57.9</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>7,321</b>

**Table 1(b) Population of slum areas in Developed Regions at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>DEVELOPED REGIONS</b>	<b>1,193,737</b>	<b>901,519</b>	<b>75.5</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>54,068</b>	<b>Southern Europe</b>					
<b>Europe</b>	<b>726,315</b>	<b>534,263</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>33,062</b>	Albania	3,145	1,351	42.9	7.0	95
<b>Eastern Europe</b>						Andorra	90	83	92.2	5.6	5
Belarus	10,147	7,058	69.6	5.6	395	Bosnia and Herzegovina	4,067	1,764	43.4	7.8	137
Bulgaria	7,867	5,303	67.4	5.6	297	Croatia	4,655	2,706	58.1	7.8	210
Czech Republic	10,260	7,647	74.5	5.6	428	Gibraltar	27	27	100.0	5.6	2
Hungary	9,917	6,428	64.8	5.6	360	Greece	10,623	6,408	60.3	5.6	359
Poland	38,577	24,123	62.5	5.6	1,351	Holy See	1	1	100.0	5.6	0
Romania	22,388	12,363	55.2	18.8	2,326	Italy	57,503	38,565	67.1	5.6	2,160
Russian Federation	144,664	105,455	72.9	5.6	5,905	Malta	392	357	91.2	5.6	20
Slovakia	5,403	3,111	57.6	5.6	174	Portugal	10,033	6,601	65.8	14.0	924
Ukraine	49,112	33,385	68.0	6.1	2,027	San Marino	27	24	90.4	5.6	1
<b>Northern Europe</b>						Slovenia	1,985	975	49.1	5.6	55
Channel Islands	145	42	28.9	5.6	2	Spain	39,921	31,073	77.8	5.6	1,740
Denmark	5,333	4,538	85.1	5.6	254	TFYR of Macedonia	2,044	1,213	59.4	7.8	94
Estonia	1,377	955	69.4	12.2	117	Yugoslavia	10,538	5,446	51.7	4.6	250
Faeroe Islands	47	18	38.4	5.6	1	<b>Western Europe</b>					
Finland	5,178	3,031	58.5	5.6	170	Austria	8,075	5,444	67.4	5.6	305
Iceland	281	261	92.7	5.6	15	Belgium	10,264	9,997	97.4	14.9	1,490
Ireland	3,841	2,276	59.3	0.8	18	France	59,453	44,903	75.5	5.5	2,470
Isle of Man	76	58	76.8	5.6	3	Germany	82,007	71,948	87.7	4.1	2,950
Latvia	2,406	1,437	59.8	5.6	80	Liechtenstein	33	7	21.5	5.6	0
Lithuania	3,689	2,532	68.6	5.6	142	Luxembourg	442	406	91.9	5.6	23
Norway	4,488	3,365	75.0	5.6	188	Monaco	34	34	100.0	5.6	2
Sweden	8,833	7,358	83.3	5.6	412	Netherlands	15,930	14,272	89.6	9.1	1,299
United Kingdom	59,542	53,313	89.5	5.6	2,986	Republic of Moldova	4,285	1,775	41.4	31.0	550
						Switzerland	7,170	4,826	67.3	5.6	270
						<b>Other</b>	<b>467,422</b>	<b>367,256</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>21,006</b>
						Canada	31,015	24,472	78.9	5.8	1,419
						United States of America	285,926	221,408	77.4	5.8	12,842
						Australia	19,338	17,635	91.2	1.6	282
						New Zealand	3,808	3,272	85.9	1.0	33
						Japan	127,335	100,469	78.9	6.4	6,430

**Table 1(c) Population of slum areas in Africa at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>Northern Africa</b>	<b>145,581</b>	<b>75,693</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>21,355</b>	<b>Sub-Saharan Africa</b>	<b>667,022</b>	<b>231,052</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>166,208</b>
Algeria	30,841	17,801	57.7	11.8	2,101	Kenya	31,293	10,751	34.4	70.7	7,605
Egypt	69,080	29,475	42.7	39.9	11,762	Lesotho	2,057	592	28.8	57.0	337
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	5,408	4,757	88.0	35.2	1,674	Liberia	3,108	1,414	45.5	55.7	788
Morocco	30,430	17,082	56.1	32.7	5,579	Madagascar	16,437	4,952	30.1	92.9	4,603
Tunisia	9,562	6,329	66.2	3.7	234	Malawi	11,572	1,745	15.1	91.1	1,590
Western Sahara	260	249	95.7	2.0	5	Mali	11,677	3,606	30.9	93.2	3,361
						Mauritania	2,747	1,624	59.1	94.3	1,531
						Mauritius	1,171	486	41.6		
<b>Sub-Saharan Africa</b>	<b>667,022</b>	<b>231,052</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>166,208</b>	Mayotte					
Angola	13,527	4,715	34.9	83.1	3,918	Mozambique	18,644	6,208	33.3	94.1	5,841
Benin	6,446	2,774	43.0	83.6	2,318	Namibia	1,788	561	31.4	37.9	213
Botswana	1,554	768	49.4	60.7	466	Niger	11,227	2,366	21.1	96.2	2,277
Burkina Faso	11,856	1,999	16.9	76.5	1,528	Nigeria	116,929	52,539	44.9	79.2	41,595
Burundi	6,502	603	9.3	65.3	394	Réunion	732	528	72.1		
Cameroon	15,203	7,558	49.7	67.0	5,064	Rwanda	7,949	497	6.3	87.9	437
Cape Verde	437	277	63.5	69.6	193	Saint Helena	6	5	71.9	2.0	0
Central African Republic	3,782	1,575	41.7	92.4	1,455	Sao Tome & Principe	140	67	47.7	2.0	1
Chad	8,135	1,964	24.1	99.1	1,947	Senegal	9,662	4,653	48.2	76.4	3,555
Comoros	727	246	33.8	61.2	151	Seychelles	81	53	64.6	2.0	1
Congo	3,110	2,056	66.1	90.1	1,852	Sierra Leone	4,587	1,714	37.3	95.8	1,642
Cote d'Ivoire	16,349	7,197	44.0	67.9	4,884	Somalia	9,157	2,557	27.9	97.1	2,482
Democratic Republic of the Congo	52,522	16,120	30.7	49.5	7,985	South Africa	43,792	25,260	57.7	33.2	8,376
Djibouti	644	542	84.2			Sudan	31,809	11,790	37.1	85.7	10,107
Equatorial Guinea	470	232	49.3	86.5	201	Swaziland	938	250	26.7		
Eritrea	3,816	730	19.1	69.9	510	Togo	4,657	1,579	33.9	80.6	1,273
Ethiopia	64,459	10,222	15.9	99.4	10,159	Uganda	24,023	3,486	14.5	93.0	3,241
Gabon	1,262	1,038	82.3	66.2	688	United Republic of Tanzania	35,965	11,982	33.3	92.1	11,031
Gambia	1,337	418	31.3	67.0	280	Zambia	10,649	4,237	39.8	74.0	3,136
Ghana	19,734	7,177	36.4	69.6	4,993	Zimbabwe	12,852	4,630	36.0	3.4	157
Guinea	8,274	2,312	27.9	72.3	1,672						
Guinea-Bissau	1,227	397	32.3	93.4	371						

**Table 1(d) Population of slum areas in Latin America & the Caribbean at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>Latin America &amp; the Caribbean</b>	<b>526,657</b>	<b>399,385</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<b>31.9</b>	<b>127,567</b>	Guadeloupe	431	430	99.6	6.9	30
Anguilla	12	12	100.0	40.6	5	Guatemala	11,687	4,668	39.9	61.8	2,884
Antigua and Barbuda	65	24	37.1	6.9	2	Guyana	763	280	36.7	4.9	14
Argentina	37,488	33,119	88.3	33.1	10,964	Haiti	8,270	3,004	36.3	85.7	2,574
Aruba	104	53	51.0	2.0	1	Honduras	6,575	3,531	53.7	18.1	638
Bahamas	308	274	88.9	2.0	5	Jamaica	2,598	1,470	56.6	35.7	525
Barbados	268	136	50.5	1.0	1	Martinique	386	367	95.2	2.0	7
Belize	231	111	48.1	62.0	69	Mexico	100,368	74,846	74.6	19.6	14,692
Bermuda	63	63	100.0	1.0	1	Montserrat	3	0	13.1	8.8	0
Bolivia	8,516	5,358	62.9	61.3	3,284	Netherlands Antilles	217	151	69.3	1.0	2
Brazil	172,559	141,041	81.7	36.6	51,676	Nicaragua	5,208	2,943	56.5	80.9	2,382
British Virgin Islands	24	15	62.0	3.0	0	Panama	2,899	1,639	56.5	30.8	505
Cayman Islands	40	40	100.0	2.0	1	Paraguay	5,636	3,194	56.7	25.0	797
Chile	15,402	13,254	86.1	8.6	1,143	Peru	26,093	19,084	73.1	68.1	12,993
Colombia	42,803	32,319	75.5	21.8	7,057	Puerto Rico	3,952	2,987	75.6	2.0	59
Costa Rica	4,112	2,448	59.5	12.8	313	Saint Kitts and Nevis	38	13	34.2	5.0	1
Cuba	11,237	8,482	75.5	2.0	169	Saint Lucia	149	57	38.0	11.9	7
Dominica	71	50	71.4	14.0	7	St Vincent & the Grenadines	114	64	56.0	5.0	3
Dominican Republic	8,507	5,615	66.0	37.6	2,111	Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon	7	6	92.2	8.7	1
Ecuador	12,880	8,171	63.4	25.6	2,095	Suriname	419	313	74.8	6.9	22
El Salvador	6,400	3,935	61.5	35.2	1,386	Trinidad and Tobago	1,300	969	74.5	32.0	310
Falkland Is (Malvinas)	2	2	81.3	2.0	0	Turks and Caicos Islands	17	8	45.6	2.0	0
French Guiana	170	128	75.2	12.9	16	Uruguay	122	57	46.7	6.9	4
Greenland	56	46	82.3	18.5	9	US Virgin Islands	3,361	3,097	92.1	2.0	62
Grenada	94	36	38.4	6.9	2	Venezuela	24,632	21,475	87.2	40.7	8,738

**Table 1(e) Population of slum areas in Asia at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>Eastern Asia</b>	<b>1,364,438</b>	<b>533,182</b>	<b>39.1</b>	<b>36.4</b>	<b>193,824</b>	Lao People's Democratic Republic	5,403	1,066	19.7	66.1	705
China	1,284,972	471,927	36.7	37.8	178,256	Malaysia	22,633	13,154	58.1	2.0	262
Hong Kong SAR of China	6,961	6,961	100.0	2.0	139	Myanmar	48,364	13,606	28.1	26.4	3,596
Macao SAR of China	449	444	98.9	2.0	9	Philippines	77,131	45,812	59.4	44.1	20,183
Korea, (Democratic People's Rep of)	22,428	13,571	60.5	0.7	95	Singapore	4,108	4,108	100.0	0.0	0
Korea, (Republic of)	47,069	38,830	82.5	37.0	14,385	Thailand	63,584	12,709	20.0	2.0	253
Mongolia	2,559	1,449	56.6	64.9	940	Timor-Leste	750	56	7.5	12.0	7
						Viet Nam	79,175	19,395	24.5	47.4	9,197
<b>South-central Asia</b>	<b>1,506,725</b>	<b>452,484</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>262,354</b>	<b>Western Asia</b>	<b>192,445</b>	<b>124,943</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>41,331</b>
Afghanistan	22,474	5,019	22.3	98.5	4,945	Armenia	3,788	2,547	67.2	2.0	51
Bangladesh	140,369	35,896	25.6	84.7	30,403	Azerbaijan	8,096	4,195	51.8	7.2	301
Bhutan	2,141	158	7.4	44.1	70	Bahrain	652	603	92.5	2.0	12
India	1,025,096	285,608	27.9	55.5	158,418	Cyprus	790	555	70.2	0.0	0
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	71,369	46,204	64.7	44.2	20,406	Georgia	5,239	2,960	56.5	8.5	252
Kazakhstan	16,095	8,980	55.8	29.7	2,664	Iraq	23,584	15,907	67.4	56.7	9,026
Kyrgyzstan	4,986	1,709	34.3	51.8	885	Israel	6,172	5,666	91.8	2.0	113
Maldives	300	84	28.0	0.0	0	Jordan	5,051	3,979	78.7	15.7	623
Nepal	23,593	2,874	12.2	92.4	2,656	Kuwait	1,971	1,894	96.1	3.0	56
Pakistan	144,971	48,425	33.4	73.6	35,627	Lebanon	3,556	3,203	90.1	50.0	1,602
Sri Lanka	19,104	4,409	23.1	13.6	597	Occupied Palestinian Territory	3,311	2,222	67.1	60.0	1,333
Tajikistan	6,135	1,696	27.7	56.0	951	Oman	2,622	2,006	76.5	60.5	1,214
Turkmenistan	4,835	2,172	44.9	2.0	43	Qatar	575	534	92.9	2.0	11
Uzbekistan	25,257	9,250	36.6	50.7	4,689	Saudi Arabia	21,028	18,229	86.7	19.8	3,609
						Syrian Arab Republic	16,610	8,596	51.8	10.4	892
<b>South-eastern Asia</b>	<b>529,764</b>	<b>202,854</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>56,781</b>	Turkey	67,632	44,755	66.2	42.6	19,080
Brunei Darussalam	335	244	72.8	2.0	5	United Arab Emirates	2,654	2,314	87.2	2.0	46
Cambodia	13,441	2,348	17.5	72.2	1,696	Yemen	19,114	4,778	25.0	65.1	3,110
Indonesia	214,840	90,356	42.1	23.1	20,877						

**Table 1(f) Population of slum areas in Oceania at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>Oceania</b>	<b>7,755</b>	<b>2,072</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>499</b>	New Caledonia	220	172	78.1	2.0	3
American Samoa	70	37	53.2	1.0	0	Northern Mariana Islands	76	40	52.8	2.0	1
Cook Islands	20	12	59.1	0.0	0	Palau	20	14	69.3	0.0	0
Fiji	823	413	50.2	67.8	280	Papua New Guinea	4,920	868	17.6	19.0	165
French Polynesia	237	125	52.6	1.0	1	Samoa	159	35	22.3	9.8	3
Guam	158	63	39.5	2.0	1	Solomon Islands	463	94	20.2	7.9	7
Kiribati	84	32	38.6	55.7	18	Tokelau	1	0	—	5.9	0
Marshall Islands	52	34	66.0	2.0	1	Tonga	99	33	33.0	1.0	0
Micronesia (Federated States of)	126	36	28.6	2.0	1	Tuvalu	10	5	53.2	0.0	0
Nauru	13	13	100.0	2.0	0	Vanuatu	202	45	22.1	37.0	17
Niue	2	1	33.1	0.0	0						

**Table 1(g) Population of slum areas in Transition countries at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>Transition countries</b>	<b>410,957</b>	<b>258,536</b>	<b>62.9</b>	<b>9.6</b>	<b>24,831</b>	<b>Other Europe</b>	<b>128,318</b>	<b>77,354</b>	<b>60.3</b>	<b>7.9</b>	<b>6,116</b>
<i>Commonwealth of Independent States</i>	282,639	181,182	64.1	10.3	18,714	Albania	3,145	1,351	42.9	7.0	95
Armenia	3,788	2,547	67.2	2.0	51	Bosnia and Herzegovina	4,067	1,764	43.4	7.8	137
Azerbaijan	8,096	4,195	51.8	7.2	301	Bulgaria	7,867	5,303	67.4	5.6	297
Belarus	10,147	7,058	69.6	5.6	395	Croatia	4,655	2,706	58.1	7.8	210
Georgia	5,239	2,960	56.5	8.5	252	Czech Republic	10,260	7,647	74.5	5.6	428
Kazakhstan	16,095	8,980	55.8	29.7	2,664	Estonia	1,377	955	69.4	12.2	117
Kyrgyzstan	4,986	1,709	34.3	51.8	885	Hungary	9,917	6,428	64.8	5.6	360
Republic of Moldova	4,285	1,775	41.4	31.0	550	Latvia	2,406	1,437	59.8	5.6	80
Russian Federation	144,664	105,455	72.9	5.6	5,905	Lithuania	3,689	2,532	68.6	5.6	142
Tajikistan	6,135	1,696	27.7	56.0	951	Poland	38,577	24,123	62.5	5.6	1,351
Turkmenistan	4,835	2,172	44.9	2.0	43	Romania	22,388	12,363	55.2	18.8	2,326
Ukraine	49,112	33,385	68.0	6.1	2,027	Serbia and Montenegro	10,538	5,446	51.7	4.6	250
Uzbekistan	25,257	9,250	36.6	50.7	4,689	Slovakia	5,403	3,111	57.6	5.6	174
						Slovenia	1,985	975	49.1	5.6	55
						TFYR of Macedonia	2,044	1,213	59.4	7.8	94

**Table 1(h) Population of slum areas in Least Developed Countries (LDCs) at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>Least Developed Countries (LDCs)</b>	<b>684,615</b>	<b>179,239</b>	<b>26.2</b>	<b>78.2</b>	<b>140,114</b>	Liberia	3,108	1,414	45.5	55.7	788
Afghanistan	22,474	5,019	22.3	98.5	4,945	Madagascar	16,437	4,952	30.1	92.9	4,603
Angola	13,527	4,715	34.9	83.1	3,918	Malawi	11,572	1,745	15.1	91.1	1,590
Bangladesh	140,369	35,896	25.6	84.7	30,403	Maldives	300	84	28.0	0.0	0
Benin	6,446	2,774	43.0	83.6	2,318	Mali	11,677	3,606	30.9	93.2	3,361
Bhutan	2,141	158	7.4	44.1	70	Mauritania	2,747	1,624	59.1	94.3	1,531
Burkina Faso	11,856	1,999	16.9	76.5	1,528	Mozambique	18,644	6,208	33.3	94.1	5,841
Burundi	6,502	603	9.3	65.3	394	Myanmar	48,364	13,606	28.1	26.4	3,596
Cambodia	13,441	2,348	17.5	72.2	1,696	Nepal	23,593	2,874	12.2	92.4	2,656
Cape Verde	437	277	63.5	69.6	193	Niger	11,227	2,366	21.1	96.2	2,277
Central African Republic	3,782	1,575	41.7	92.4	1,455	Rwanda	7,949	497	6.3	87.9	437
Chad	8,135	1,964	24.1	99.1	1,947	Samoa	159	35	22.3	9.8	3
Comoros	727	246	33.8	61.2	151	Sao Tome and Principe	140	67	47.7	2.0	1
Democratic Republic of the Congo	52,522	16,120	30.7	49.5	7,985	Senegal	9,662	4,653	48.2	76.4	3,555
Djibouti	644	542	84.2			Sierra Leone	4,587	1,714	37.3	95.8	1,642
Equatorial Guinea	470	232	49.3	86.5	201	Solomon Islands	463	94	20.2	7.9	7
Eritrea	3,816	730	19.1	69.9	510	Somalia	9,157	2,557	27.9	97.1	2,482
Ethiopia	64,459	10,222	15.9	99.4	10,159	Sudan	31,809	11,790	37.1	85.7	10,107
Gambia	1,337	418	31.3	67.0	280	Togo	4,657	1,579	33.9	80.6	1,273
Guinea	8,274	2,312	27.9	72.3	1,672	Tuvalu	10	5	53.2	0.0	0
Guinea Bissau	1,227	397	32.3	93.4	371	Uganda	24,023	3,486	14.5	93.0	3,241
Haiti	8,270	3,004	36.3	85.7	2,574	United Republic of Tanzania	35,965	11,982	33.3	92.1	11,031
Kiribati	84	32	38.6	55.7	18	Vanuatu	202	45	22.1	37.0	17
Lao People's Democratic Republic	5,403	1,066	19.7	66.1	705	Yemen	19,114	4,778	25.0	65.1	3,110
Lesotho	2,057	592	28.8	57.0	337	Zambia	10,649	4,237	39.8	74.0	3,136

**Table 1(i) Population of slum areas in Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
<b>LLDCs</b>	<b>275,262</b>	<b>83,708</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>56.5</b>	<b>47,303</b>	Malawi	11,572	1,745	15.1	91.1	1,590
Afghanistan	22,474	5,019	22.3	98.5	4,945	Mali	11,677	3,606	30.9	93.2	3,361
Armenia	3,788	2,547	67.2	2.0	51	Mongolia	2,559	1,449	56.6	64.9	940
Azerbaijan	8,096	4,195	51.8	7.2	301	Nepal	23,593	2,874	12.2	92.4	2,656
Bhutan	2,141	158	7.4	44.1	70	Niger	11,227	2,366	21.1	96.2	2,277
Bolivia	8,516	5,358	62.9	61.3	3,284	Paraguay	5,636	3,194	56.7	25.0	799
Botswana	1,554	768	49.4	60.7	466	Rwanda	7,949	497	6.3	87.9	437
Burkina Faso	11,856	1,999	16.9	76.5	1,528	Swaziland	938	250	26.7		
Burundi	6,502	603	9.3	65.3	394	Tajikistan	6,135	1,696	27.7	56.0	951
Central African Republic	437	277	63.5	92.4	256	TFYR of Macedonia	4,835	2,172	44.9	7.8	169
Chad	3,782	1,575	41.7	99.1	1,561	Turkmenistan	24,023	3,486	14.5	2.0	69
Ethiopia	8,135	1,964	24.1	99.4	1,952	Uganda	25,257	9,250	36.6	93.0	8,600
Kazakhstan	16,095	8,980	55.8	29.7	2,664	Uzbekistan	10,538	5,446	51.7	50.7	2,761
Kyrgyzstan	4,986	1,709	34.3	51.8	885	Zambia	10,649	4,237	39.8	74.0	3,136
Lao People's Democratic Republic	5,403	1,066	19.7	66.1	705	Zimbabwe	12,852	4,630	36.0	3.4	157
Lesotho	2,057	592	28.8	57.0	337						

**Table 1(j) Population of slum areas in Small Island Developing States (SIDS) at mid-year, by region and country 2001**

Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)	Region/country	Total population (thousands)	Urban population (thousands)	Percentage urban	Percentage slum	Slum Population (thousands)
Small Island Developing States (SIDS) 51,894						Marshall Islands	52	34	66.0	2.0	1
Antigua and Barbuda	65	24	37.1	6.9	2	Mauritius	1,171	486	41.6		
Aruba	104	53	51.0	2.0	1	Micronesia (Federated States of)	126	36	28.6	2.0	1
Bahamas	308	274	88.9	2.0	5	Nauru	13	13	100.0	2.0	0
Bahrain	652	603	92.5	44.1	266	Netherlands Antilles	217	151	69.3	1.0	2
Barbados	268	136	50.5	1.0	1	Niue	2	1	33.1	0.0	0
Belize	231	111	48.1	62.0	69	Palau	20	14	69.3	0.0	0
Cape Verde	437	277	63.5	69.6	193	Papua New Guinea	4,920	868	17.6	19.0	165
Comoros	727	246	33.8	61.2	151	Saint Kitts and Nevis	38	13	34.2	5.0	1
Cook Islands	20	12	59.1	0.0	0	Saint Lucia	149	57	38.0	11.9	7
Cuba	11,237	8,482	75.5	2.0	169	Samoa	159	35	22.3	9.8	3
Cyprus	790	555	70.2	0.0	0	Sao Tome & Principe	140	67	47.7	2.0	1
Dominica	71	50	71.4	14.0	7	Seychelles	81	53	64.6	2.0	1
Dominican Republic	8,507	5,615	66.0	37.6	2,111	Singapore	4,108	4,108	100.0	0.0	0
Fiji	823	413	50.2	67.8	280	Solomon Islands	463	94	20.2	7.9	7
Grenada	94	36	38.4	6.9	2	St Vincent & the Grenadines	114	64	56.0	5.0	3
Guinea-Bissau	1,227	397	32.3	93.4	371	Suriname	419	313	74.8	6.9	22
Guyana	763	280	36.7	4.9	14	Tokelau	1	0	—	5.9	0
Haiti	8,270	3,004	36.3	85.7	2,574	Tonga	99	33	33.0	1.0	0
Jamaica	2,598	1,470	56.6	35.7	525	Trinidad and Tobago	1,300	969	74.5	32.0	310
Kiribati	84	32	38.6	55.7	18	Tuvalu	10	5	53.2	0.0	0
Maldives	300	84	28.0	0.0	0	US Virgin Islands	122	57	46.7	2.0	1
Malta	392	357	91.2	5.6	20	Vanuatu	202	45	22.1	37.0	17

**Table 2(a) Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Europe**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water		Lack of Improved Sanitation		Lack of Sufficient Living Area		Lack of Durability of Housing		Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation		Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area		Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing		Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
EUROPE																	
Eastern Europe																	
Belarus	7,058	69.6	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Bulgaria	5,303	67.4	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0	d,h	5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Czech Republic	7,647	74.5	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0	d,h	5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Hungary	6,428	64.8	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0	d,h	5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Poland	24,123	62.5	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0		5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Republic of Moldova	1,775	41.4	0.0	c	26.9	c			5.6	h	26.9		26.9		31.0		31.0 c4
Romania	12,363	55.2	9.0	c	14.0	c	0.0		5.6	h	14.0		14.0		18.8		18.8 c4
Russian Federation	105,455	72.9	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Slovakia	3,111	57.6	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0		5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Ukraine	33,385	68.0	0.0	c	0.5	c			5.6	h	0.5		0.5		6.1		6.1 c4
Northern Europe																	
Channel Islands	42	28.9	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Denmark	4,538	85.1	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Estonia	955	69.4	0.0	c	7.0	c			5.6	h	7.0		7.0		12.2		12.2 c4
Faeroe Islands	18	38.4	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Finland	3,031	58.5	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0	d,h	5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Iceland	261	92.7	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Ireland	2,276	59.3	0.0	c	0.0	c			0.8	d	0.0		0.0		0.8		0.8 c4
Isle of Man	58	76.8	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Latvia	1,437	59.8	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Lithuania	2,532	68.6	0.0	c	0.0	c			5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Norway	3,365	75.0	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0		5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
Sweden	7,358	83.3	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0		5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4
United Kingdom	53,313	89.5	0.0	c	0.0	c	0.0		5.6	h	0.0		0.0		5.6		5.6 c4

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data

**Table 2(b) Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Africa**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water	Lack of Improved Sanitation	Lack of Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Durability of Housing	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing	Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
<b>AFRICA</b>										
<b>Eastern Africa</b>										
Burundi	603	9.3	4.0 f	63.9 f	-	-	65.3			65.3 c2
Comoros	246	33.8	2.0 c	60.4 c	-	-	61.2			61.2 c2
Djibouti	542	84.2	nd	nd	-	-	-			- -
Eritrea	730	19.1	37.0 a	52.2 a	0.0 a	34.9 a	69.9			69.9 c2
Ethiopia	10,222	15.9	23.0 a	96.2 a	38.1 a	65.9 a	97.1	98.2	99.4	99.4 c4
Kenya	10,751	34.4	13.0 a	46.3 a	21.7 a	20.0 a	53.3	63.4	70.7	70.7 c4
Madagascar	4,952	30.1	15.0 a	83.7 a	43.9 a	9.2 a	86.1	92.2	92.9	92.9 c4
Malawi	1,745	15.1	5.0 a	82.1 a	23.7 a	31.5 a	83.0	87.0	91.1	91.1 c4
Mauritius	486	41.6	0.0 c	0.0 c	0.0 d,h	-	0.0	0.0		- -
Mozambique	6,208	33.3	14.0 a	85.2 a	24.9 a	38.1 a	87.3	90.4	94.1	94.1 c4
Réunion	528	72.1	0.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 d,h	-	1.0	1.0		- -
Rwanda	497	6.3	40.0 a	62.3 a	13.8 a	38.2 a	77.4	80.5	87.9	87.9 c4
Seychelles	53	64.6	1.0 c	1.0 c	- -		2.0			- -
Somalia	2,557	27.9	23.0 c	96.2 c	- -		97.1			97.1 c2
Uganda	3,486	14.5	28.0 c,a	83.6 c,a	19.2 a	26.4 a	88.2	90.5	93.0	93.0 c4
United Republic of Tanzania	11,982	33.3	20.0 b	81.6 b	16.5 a	35.4 a	85.3	87.7	92.1	92.1 c4
Zambia	4,237	39.8	12.0 a	54.1 a	24.4 a	14.9 a	59.6	69.5	74.0	74.0 c4
Zimbabwe	4,630	36.0	0.0 a	3.4 a	15.9 a	2.8 a	3.4			3.4 c2
<b>Middle Africa</b>										
Angola	4,715	34.9	66.0 b	50.3 b	-	-	83.1			83.1 c2
Cameroon	7,558	49.7	18.0 a	44.8 a	10.1 a	18.9 a	54.7	59.3	67.0	67.0 c4
Central African Republic	1,575	41.7	20.0 a	59.7 a	13.0 a	72.9 a	67.8	72.0	92.4	92.4 c4
Chad	1,964	24.1	69.0 a	71.7 a	31.1 a	85.4 a	91.2	94.0	99.1	99.1 c4
Congo	2,056	66.1	29.0 c	86.0 c	-	-	90.1			90.1 c2
Democratic Republic of the Congo	16,120	30.7	11.0 c,b	43.3 c,b	-	-	49.5			49.5 c2
Equatorial Guinea	232	49.3	55.0 c	70.0 c	-	-	86.5			86.5 c2
Gabon	1,038	82.3	27.0 a	42.5 a	11.8 a	8.8 a	58.0	63.0	66.2	66.2 c4
Sao Tome and Principe	67	47.7	1.0 c	1.0 c	- -		2.0			- -

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data

**Table 2(b) cont. Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Africa**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water	Lack of Improved Sanitation	Lack of Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Durability of Housing	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing	Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
<b>Northern Africa</b>										
Algeria	17,801	57.7	2.0 b	10.0 b	-	-	11.8			11.8 c2
Egypt	29,475	42.7	4.0 a	37.4 a	-	4.2 a	39.9			39.9 c2
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	4,757	88.0	28.0 c	10.0 c	-	-	35.2			35.2 c2
Morocco	17,082	56.1	0.0 a	5.6 a	27.8 a	1.2 a	5.6	31.8	32.7	32.7 c4
Sudan	11,790	37.1	14.0 c	83.4 c	-	-	85.7			85.7 c2
Tunisia	6,329	66.2	0.0 b	3.7 b	-	-	3.7			3.7 c2
Western Sahara	249	95.7	0.0 c	1.0 c	-	-	1.0			- -
<b>Southern Africa</b>										
Botswana	768	49.4	0.0 b	60.7 b	-	-	60.7			60.7 c2
Lesotho	592	28.8	2.0 c	56.1 c	10.6 d,h	-	57.0			57.0 c2
Namibia	561	31.4	0.0 a	13.7 a	20.4 a	9.6 a	13.7	31.3	37.9	37.9 c4
South Africa	25,260	57.7	8.0 f	11.6 f	12.1 a	6.5 a	18.7	28.5	33.2	33.2 c4
Swaziland	250	26.7	0.0 c	1.0 c	-	-	1.0			- -
<b>Western Africa</b>										
Benin	2,774	43.0	26.0 a	66.1 a	17.8 a	20.3 a	74.9	79.4	83.6	83.6 c4
Burkina Faso	1,999	16.9	16.0 a	64.1 a	15.5 a	7.6 a	69.8	74.5	76.5	76.5 c4
Cape Verde	277	63.5	36.0 c	52.5 c	-	-	69.6			69.6 c2
Côte d'Ivoire	7,197	44.0	10.0 a	53.5 a	22.6 a	0.8 a	58.2	67.6	67.9	67.9 c4
Gambia	418	31.3	20.0 c	58.8 c	0.0 d,h	-	67.0			67.0 c2
Ghana	7,177	36.4	13.0 a	55.2 a	21.2 a	0.9 a	61.0	69.3	69.6	69.6 c4
Guinea	2,312	27.9	28.0 a	44.7 a	24.0 a	8.5 a	60.2	69.7	72.3	72.3 c4
Guinea-Bissau	397	32.3	71.0 c	77.4 c	-	-	93.4			93.4 c2
Liberia	1,414	45.5	2.0 c	54.8 c	-	-	55.7			55.7 c2
Mali	3,606	30.9	26.0 a	81.2 a	21.7 a	37.6 a	86.1	89.1	93.2	93.2 c4
Mauritania	1,624	59.1	66.0 a	55.8 a	33.8 a	42.3 a	85.0	90.1	94.3	94.3 c4
Niger	2,366	21.1	30.0 b	88.1 b	30.2 a	35.4 a	91.7	94.2	96.2	96.2 c4
Nigeria	52,539	44.9	19.0 a	60.6 a	26.5 a	11.2 a	68.1	76.5	79.2	79.2 c4
Saint Helena	5	71.9	1.0 c	1.0 c	-	-	2.0			- -
Senegal	4,653	48.2	8.0 a	62.3 a	27.3 a	6.4 a	65.3	74.8	76.4	76.4 c4
Sierra Leone	1,714	37.3	77.0 c	81.7 c	-	-	95.8			95.8 c2
Togo	1,579	33.9	15.0 a	70.2 a	19.7 a	4.8 a	74.7	79.7	80.6	80.6 c4

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data

**Table 2(c) Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Latin America and Northern America**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water	Lack of Improved Sanitation	Lack of Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Durability of Housing	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing	Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
<b>LATIN AMERICA</b>										
<b>Caribbean</b>										
Anguilla	12	100.0	40.0 c	1.0 c			40.6			40.6 c2
Antigua and Barbuda	24	37.1	5.0 c	2.0 c			6.9			6.9 c2
Aruba	53	51.0	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 e,h		2.0	2.0		2.0 c3
Bahamas	274	88.9	2.0 c	0.0 c	0.0 e,h		2.0	2.0		2.0 c3
Barbados	136	50.5	0.0 c	1.0 c			1.0			1.0 c2
British Virgin Islands	15	62.0	2.0 c	1.0 c			3.0			3.0 c2
Cayman Islands	40	100.0	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Cuba	8,482	75.5	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Dominica	50	71.4	0.0 c	14.0 c			14.0			14.0 c2
Dominican Republic	5,615	66.0	17.0 a	7.1 a	17.0 a	2.5 a	22.9	36.0	37.6	37.6 c4
Grenada	36	38.4	3.0 c	4.0 c			6.9			6.9 c2
Guadeloupe	430	99.6	6.0 c	1.0 c			6.9			6.9 c2
Haiti	3,004	36.3	51.0 a	49.0 a	34.9 a	12.1 a	75.0	83.7	85.7	85.7 c4
Jamaica	1,470	56.6	19.0 c	20.6 c			35.7			35.7 c2
Martinique	367	95.2	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 d,h		2.0			2.0 c2
Montserrat	0	13.1	0.0 c	4.0 c			8.8			8.8 c2
Netherlands Antilles	151	69.3	1.0 c	1.0 c			1.0			1.0 c2
Puerto Rico	2,987	75.6	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 d,h		2.0	2.0		2.0 c3
Saint Kitts and Nevis	13	34.2	1.0 c	4.0 c			5.0			5.0 c2
Saint Lucia	57	38.0	1.0 c	11.0 c			11.9			11.9 c2
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	64	56.0	1.0 c	4.0 c			5.0			5.0 c2
Trinidad and Tobago	969	74.5	1.0 c	31.3 c			32.0			32.0 c2
Turks and Caicos Islands	8	45.6	0.0 c	2.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
United States Virgin Islands	57	46.7	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 d,h		2.0	2.0		2.0 c3
<b>Central America</b>										
Belize	111	48.1	17.0 c	54.2 c			62.0			62.0 c2
Costa Rica	2,448	59.5	2.0 c	11.0 c	0.0 e,h		12.8	12.8		12.8 c3
El Salvador	3,935	61.5	12.0 c	26.4 c			35.2			35.2 c2
Guatemala	4,668	39.9	3.0 a	29.1 a	30.0 a	20.6 a	31.2	51.9	61.8	61.8 c4
Honduras	3,531	53.7	3.0 c	12.0 c	4.0 d,h		14.6	18.1		18.1 c3
Mexico	74,846	74.6	6.0 c	14.5 c	0.0 d,h		19.6	19.6		19.6 c3
Nicaragua	2,943	56.5	5.0 a	56.1 a	38.0 a	29.3 a	56.5	73.1	80.9	80.9 c4
Panama	1,639	56.5	12.0 c	21.4 c	0.0 d,h		30.8	30.8		30.8 c3

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data

**Table 2(c) cont. Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Latin America and Northern America**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water	Lack of Improved Sanitation	Lack of Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Durability of Housing	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing	Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
<b>South America</b>										
Argentina	33,119	88.3	15.0 c	21.3 c			33.1			33.1 c2
Bolivia	5,358	62.9	7.0 a	31.2 a	32.7 a	10.1 a	36.0	56.9	61.3	61.3 c4
Brazil	141,041	81.7	5.0 a	24.0 a	9.9 a	2.6 a	27.8	34.9	36.6	36.6 c4
Chile	13,254	86.1	1.0 c	7.7 c			8.6			8.6 c2
Colombia	32,319	75.5	2.0 a	5.1 a	13.8 a	2.5 a	7.0	19.8	21.8	21.8 c4
Ecuador	8,171	63.4	19.0 c	8.2 c			25.6			25.6 c2
Falkland Islands (Malvinas)	2	81.3	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
French Guiana	128	75.2	12.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 d,h		12.9	12.9		12.9 c3
Guyana	280	36.7	2.0 c	3.0 c			4.9			4.9 c2
Paraguay	3,194	56.7	5.0 c	21.0 c			25.0			25.0 c2
Peru	19,084	73.1	13.0 a	34.0 a	28.0 a	22.8 a	42.6	58.7	68.1	68.1 c4
Suriname	313	74.8	6.0 c	1.0 c			6.9			6.9 c2
Uruguay	3,097	92.1	2.0 c	5.0 c	0.0 d,h		6.9	6.9		6.9 c3
Venezuela	21,475	87.2	12.0 c	32.6 c			40.7	40.7	40.7	40.7 c4
<b>Northern America</b>										
Bermuda	63	100.0	0.0 c	1.0 c	0.0		1.0			1.0 c2
Canada	24,472	78.9	0.0 f	0.0 f	0.0 f,h	5.8 h	0.0	0.0	5.8	5.8 c4
Greenland	46	82.3	17.7 c	1.0 c			18.5			18.5 c2
British Virgin Islands	15	62.0	2.0 c	1.0 c			3.0			3.0 c2
Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon	6	92.2	7.8 c	1.0 c			8.7			8.7 c2
United States of America	221,408	77.4	0.0 f	0.0 f	0.0 f,h	5.8 f	0.0	0.0	5.8	5.8 c4

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data

**Table 2(d) Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Asia**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water	Lack of Improved Sanitation	Lack of Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Durability of Housing	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing	Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
<b>ASIA</b>										
<b>Eastern Asia</b>										
China	471,927	36.7	6.0 c	33.8 c			37.8			37.8 c2
China, Hong Kong SAR	6,961	100.0	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
China, Macao SAR	444	98.9	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 d,h		2.0	2.0		2.0 c4
Korea (Democratic People's Republic of)	13,571	60.5	0.0 c	0.7 c			0.7			0.7 c2
Japan	100,469	78.9	1.0 c	0.0 c	0.0 d,h		1.0	1.0		1.0 c3
Mongolia	1,449	56.6	23.0 c	54.4 c			64.9			64.9 c2
Korea (Republic of)	38,830	82.5	3.0 c	35.1 c	0.0 d,h		37.0			37.0 c2
<b>South Central Asia</b>										
Afghanistan	5,019	22.3	81.0 c	92.2 c			98.5			98.5 c2
Bangladesh	35,896	25.6	1.0 a	55.5 a	42.2 a	39.9 a	55.9	74.5	84.7	84.7 c4
Bhutan	158	7.4	14.0 c	35.0 c			44.1			44.1 c2
India	285,608	27.9	8.0 a	32.9 a	20.2 d,h	9.6	38.3	50.7	55.5	55.5 c4
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	46,204	64.7	1.0 c	43.6 c			44.2			44.2 c2
Kazakhstan	8,980	55.8	2.0 a	26.7 a	1.8 a	0.3 a	28.2	29.5	29.7	29.7 c4
Kyrgyzstan	1,709	34.3	2.0 a	48.2 a	4.7 a	0.3 a	49.2	51.6	51.8	51.8 c4
Maldives	84	28.0	0.0 c	0.0 c			0.0			0.0 c2
Nepal	2,874	12.2	15.0 a	79.7 a	33.1 a	34.4 a	82.7	88.5	92.4	92.4 c4
Pakistan	48,425	33.4	4.0 a	12.0 a	59.0 a	23.7 a	15.5	65.4	73.6	73.6 c4
Sri Lanka	4,409	23.1	9.0 c	5.0 c	13.8 d,h		13.6			13.6 c2
Tajikistan	1,696	27.7	1.0 c	55.6 c			56.0			56.0 c2
Turkmenistan	2,172	44.9	1.0 a	1.0 a		0.8 a,h	2.0			2.0 c2
Uzbekistan	9,250	36.6	4.0 a	43.1 a	7.8 a	2.1 a	45.4	49.6	50.7	50.7 c4
<b>South Eastern Asia</b>										
Brunei Darussalam	244	72.8	1.0 a	1.0 a			2.0			2.0 c2
Cambodia	2,348	17.5	47.0 c	47.6 c			72.2			72.2 c2
East Timor	56	7.5	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Indonesia	90,356	42.1	9.0 a	15.5 a		12.7 a	23.1			23.1 c2
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1,066	19.7	41.0 c	42.6 c			66.1			66.1 c2
Malaysia	13,154	58.1	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Myanmar	13,606	28.1	12.0 c	16.4 c			26.4			26.4 c2
Philippines	45,812	59.4	8.0 a	12.6 a	27.3 a	4.3	19.6	41.5	44.1	44.1 c4
Singapore	4,108	100.0	0.0 c	0.0 c			0.0			0.0 c2
Thailand	12,709	20.0	11.0 c	1.1 c		7.1	12.0			12.0 c2
Viet Nam	19,395	24.5	19.0 a	29.9 a	0.0 a,h	7.4 a,h	43.2	43.2	47.4	47.4 c4

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data

**Table 2(d) cont. Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Asia**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water	Lack of Improved Sanitation	Lack of Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Durability of Housing	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing	Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
<b>Western Asia</b>										
Armenia	2,547	67.2	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Azerbaijan	4,195	51.8	1.0 c	1.0 c	5.3 d,h		2.0	7.2		7.2 c3
Bahrain	603	92.5	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Cyprus	555	70.2	0.0 c	0.0 c	0.0 d,h		0.0	0.0		0.0 c4
Georgia	2,960	56.5	1.0 c	7.6 c			8.5			8.5 c2
Iraq	15,907	67.4	4.0 c	53.5 c	3.1 d,h		55.4	56.7		56.7 c3
Israel	5,666	91.8	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 d,h		2.0	2.0		2.0 c3
Jordan	3,979	78.7	0.0 a	4.4 a	11.7 a,h	0.1	4.4	15.6	15.7	15.7 c4
Kuwait	1,894	96.1	1.0 c	1.0 c	1.0 d,h		2.0	3.0		3.0 c2
Lebanon	3,203	90.1	0.0 c	50.0 c			50.0			50.0 c2
Occupied Palestinian Territory	2,222	67.1	1.0 c	59.6 c			60.0			60.0 c2
Oman	2,006	76.5	59.0 c	3.7 c			60.5			60.5 c2
Qatar	534	92.9	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Saudi Arabia	18,229	86.7	0.0 c	19.8 c			19.8			19.8 c2
Syrian Arab Republic	8,596	51.8	6.0 c	1.6 c	3.1 d,h		7.5	10.4		10.4 c3
Turkey	44,755	66.2	18.0 a	10.8 a	7.4 d,h	15.3	26.9	32.3	42.6	42.6 c4
United Arab Emirates	2,314	87.2	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Yemen	4,778	25.0	15.0 a	43.6 a	13.8 a,h	15.5	52.1	58.7	65.1	65.1 c4

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data

**Table 2(e) Percentage of households lacking either of the indicators defining slums in Oceania**

Region/country	Urban Popn. (000s) <sup>1</sup>	%age Urban	Lack of Improved Water	Lack of Improved Sanitation	Lack of Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Durability of Housing	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area	Lack of Improved Water or Improved Sanitation or Sufficient Living Area or Durability of Housing	Final Estimation of Number of Slum Dwellers
<b>OCEANIA</b>										
<b>Australia/New Zealand</b>										
Australia (developed)	17,635	91.2	0.0 c	0.0 c		1.6 e	0.0	0.0	1.6	1.6 c4
New Zealand (developed)	3,272	85.9	0.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 f,h		1.0			1.0 c2
<b>Melanesia</b>										
Fiji	413	50.2	57.0 c	25.0 c			67.8			67.8 c2
New Caledonia	172	78.1	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 f,h		2.0			2.0 c2
Papua New Guinea	868	17.6	12.0 c	8.0 c			19.0			19.0 c2
Solomon Islands	94	20.2	6.0 c	2.0 c			7.9			7.9 c2
Vanuatu	45	22.1	37.0 c	0.0 c			37.0			37.0 c2
<b>Micronesia</b>										
Guam	63	39.5	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 f,h		2.0			2.0 c2
Kiribati	32	38.6	18.0 c	46.0 c			55.7			55.7 c2
Marshall Islands	34	66.0	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Micronesia (Federated States of)	36	28.6	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Nauru	13	100.0	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Northern Mariana Islands	40	52.8	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2
Palau	14	69.3	0.0 c	0.0 c			0.0			0.0 c2
<b>Polynesia</b>										
American Samoa	37	53.2	0.0 c	1.0 c			1.0			1.0 c2
Cook Islands	12	59.1	0.0 c	0.0 c			0.0			0.0 c2
French Polynesia	125	52.6	0.0 c	1.0 c			1.0			1.0 c2
Niue	1	33.1	0.0 c	0.0 c			0.0			0.0 c2
Pitcairn	0	—	1.0 c	1.0 c	0.0 f,h		2.0			2.0 c2
Samoa	35	22.3	5.0 c	5.0 c			9.8			9.8 c2
Tokelau	0	—	3.0 c	3.0 c			5.9			5.9 c2
Tonga	33	33.0	0.0 c	1.0 c			1.0			1.0 c2
Tuvalu	5	53.2	0.0 c	0.0 c			0.0			0.0 c2
Wallis and Futuna Islands	0	—	1.0 c	1.0 c			2.0			2.0 c2

1 United Nations Population Division, World Urbanization Prospects: The 2001 Revision  
a Demographic and Health Surveys  
b Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys

c UNICEF/WHO  
c2 Only the first two components are available  
c3 Only the first three components are available  
c4 Only four components  
d UNSD

e UN-HABITAT  
f National surveys/census  
g European Statistics  
h Estimation  
- No data





For more information, contact:

The Global Urban Observatory  
**Better Information for Better Cities**

UN-HABITAT  
P.O. Box 30030, Nairobi, KENYA  
Tel: (254-20) 623119, Fax: (254-20) 623080  
E-mail: [guo@unhabitat.org](mailto:guo@unhabitat.org)  
Website: [www.unhabitat.org/guo](http://www.unhabitat.org/guo)



UN-HABITAT